

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Phil

WIDENER



HN PW5M

Hartmann - God and Sin in the Appetites

1894

Phil 8610.894



Harvard College Library

BOUGHT FROM GIFTS

OF

FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY

GOD AND SIN

in the

APPETITES.

By J HARTMANN, M.D.

NEW YORK:
THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY,
28 LAFAYETTE PLACE.

MONTHLY.

(Price, 50 cents.)

\$3 PER YEAR.

Entered at Post Office, New York, March 4, 1891, as second-class matter.

0

God and Sin

in

The Appetites

By J. HARTMANN, M.D.

NEW YORK:
THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY,
28 LAFAYETTE PLACE.

Phil 8610.894

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

THE GIFT OF

FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY

May 17, 1930

CONTENTS.

PART I.	PAGE
1. When God Was Not, - - -	5
2. Progressive Development, -	8
3. When God Could Not Be, - -	12
4. Physical and Physiological Constitu- ents of God, - - - -	17
5. God and Sin in the Appetites.—Nature,	20
6. No Sin on Earth, - - - -	22
7. Forced Exertion, etc., - - -	25
8. Rules Regulating Conduct, - -	27
9. When Man First Emerged, - -	29
10. Adoption of Gods by Inheritance, -	31
11. The Struggle of the Gods, -	32
12. Sacrificial Appetites, - - -	35
13. Christians and Theologians Marvel,	38
14. Common Resemblance, - - -	40
15. Bible Sins and Punishments, -	42
16. Gifts and Sacrifices, - - - -	47
17. Blood Consecration by Moses, -	51
18. Transubstantiation, - - - -	52
PART II.	
1. God and Sin in the Sexual Appetites,	57
2. Historical Evidence, - - - -	60
3. Marital Reforms, - - - -	63
4. Bible Testimony, - - - -	66

5. Christianity's Birth in the Sexual Ap- petites, - - - -	68
6. All Things Possible with God, -	71
7. Essential Elements of Christian Re- form, - - - -	74
8. Sin in Birth, - - - -	77
9. Sins and Forgiveness, - - -	79
10. Did Christ Die for Sins Forever? -	83
11. Spiritual and Carnal, - - -	86
12. Sins of the Appetites in the Holy Roman Catholic Church, - - -	90
13. Luther's Time, - - - -	97
14. The Social Evil, Biblical and Modern,	102

APPENDIX.

1. Imperceptible Movement, - - - -	107
2. Religion has no Scientific Stability, -	108
3. At the Present Time, - - - -	110
4. The Lord's Prayer, - - - -	113
5. Missions, - - - -	119
6. Are We a Christian Nation, - - -	121
7. Followers of Reason. - - - -	124

GOD AND SIN IN THE AP- PETITES.

PART I.

§ 1. *When God Was Not.*—Those constant and uniform processes observed in nature, in both the animate and inanimate worlds, have been designated by men of highest intelligence “Laws”—the laws of nature. Centuries of careful watchfulness and observation has shown these natural laws (uniformity of action) to be invariably the same over all the earth. Surroundings and conditions being identical, the same causes produce the same effects, and this is true throughout the universe. These laws of nature (uniformity of action) governing elementary substances—in the process of organizing, producing phenomena, forming or evolving organic beings, working in mechanical contrivances, etc.—have in the past ages been a source of wonder, marvel, and astonishment, nor are they less so to the savage mind and the civilized ignoramus of to-day. To these they must continue to be mysteries throughout the future. The laws of nature (uniformity of action) are permanent, constant, invariable, unchangeable, unmodifiable, and as indestructible as the elementary substances. Forms and phenomena change, modify, appear and disappear, but the elementary substances of which

they are composed, and the laws by which they are governed, remain the same forever. They are indestructible, though living bodies are in themselves mere phenomena on the surface of the planet, and are destructible by the very same laws that built them up.

The physical laws regulating the life of living things and beings are also modes of nature; they apply equally to organized matter or to elementary substances which, in the course of evolution and in the progressive processes of nature, have not entered into organized forms. The physical activity, the physiological functions of living bodies, are also governed by laws of nature, each in a manner peculiar to itself. The phenomena exhibited by living bodies are natural and are governed by laws, as are phenomena observed in the inorganic world. Living bodies are vital mechanisms through which elementary substances are constantly exchanged, new elements taking the place of the old. This elementary exchange continues during the natural existence of all living creatures, and the exchange of elementary substances taking place in them can be accomplished only by means of the appetites.

The powers and works of nature appear superhuman only so long as we cannot give an account of their origin or mode of existence. When through study we have come to know something of the laws of nature, they are no longer supernatural, but perfectly natural. We then discover that only those matters we do not understand are incomprehensible, mysterious, wonderful—i. e., supernatural. Knowledge is the light that dissipates the supernatural and reveals to us only the natural. It brings us from the uncertain to the certain; from the fanciful, chimerical, and speculative, to the positive.

It is admitted that man belongs to nature and is composed of indestructible elements, though himself perishable—subject to the laws of nature—in the

course of evolution. The process of growth and development changes and modifies him, as all the contrivances of his own ingenuity are subject to changes and modifications by him. We cannot fail to comprehend that man's ideas, notions, opinions, habits, customs, moral and social practices, rules, laws, ceremonies, worship, religious belief, creeds, gods, divinities, arts, mechanical contrivances, inventions of whatever character, and so forth, are, in the evolution of progressive stages of civilization, ever subject to change, modification, and alteration. It is the inevitable result, not of anything supernatural, but of the natural. Positive science teaches facts which the cultured intellectual faculties have discovered jointly with the acquired experience. Thus has man unraveled some of the mysteries of nature which confused, puzzled, and confounded the ancients.

The aphorism, "There is nothing new under the sun," is true only so far as certain states or conditions in universal nature are concerned. Discoveries and inventions, the result of man's ingenuity, skill, and intellectual attainment, are all new. Ideas, imaginings, changes, and improvements have constantly succeeded and superseded one another. The new of one generation is the old of the next; and so on, through the vast ages of man, the new looms up, continually replacing the old. The transition may be imperceptible at first, but in the course of time the alteration becomes so great that the old and the new have almost lost their resemblance. Take, for example, man's artificial mode of producing light. Candles, oil, gas, oxy-hydrogen, electric light, etc.—none of these methods was divinely communicated; and yet there was a period when man had no knowledge of them, but lived without light, except sunlight, just as he lived without gods before their invention.

§ 2. *Progressive Development.*—The evolution of organic beings is constantly going on, as investigation has scientifically demonstrated within the last century. Each phase of everything on this earth's crust bears testimony to the numerous transitory changes and gradual improvements in the habitable condition of this planet, the general tendency ever being toward completer and more perfect forms of organic life. A brief notice of some of the most salient points will present the matter more clearly to our minds. Take the evidence geology yields as far as ascertained: If, for example, we examine the tabular view of the fossiliferous strata, as found by our most eminent scholars, beginning with the lowest, and following the chronological succession of the principal groups toward the surface, we shall come to a period when no life existed, either plant or animal. These strata in the order of superposition are:

IV. *Primary*, in the Silurian Age—no plant life yet known; no reptile yet known. In the Devonian age are found tribes of fishes with hard covering; no reptiles yet known. In the Carboniferous Age, great thickness of strata of fluvio-marine origin, with beds of coal of vegetable origin. The Permian Period furnishes organic remains, both animal and vegetable.

III. *The Secondary.*—In the Cretaceous Period are found Trias plants different, for the most part, from the upper Trias, Batrachian reptiles; Lias, mollusca, reptiles, and fish. In the Oolite, large saurians; plants, chiefly cycades, conifers, and ferns, with a few palms. In the Wealden, weald clay, of fresh water origin; shells of pulmoniferous mollusca and of cypris; land reptiles, etc. Upper Cretaceous, ammonite, baculite, belemnite, associated with cyp-ræa, aliva, mitra, etc., and large marine saurians.

II. *Tertiary-Eocene Period.*—Fossil shells, with very few exceptions, extinct; all the mammalia of

extinct species and the greater part of them extinct genera. In the Miocene Period, all the mammalia extinct; about two-thirds of the species of shells extinct. In the Pliocene Period, nearly, if not all the mammals extinct; a third or more of the species of the mollusca extinct; a majority of the mammals extinct; but the genera corresponding with those now surviving in the same great geographical and zoological province are found.

I. *Post Tertiary*. Period and Group—Post Pliocene, all the shells of living species; *no human remains or works of art found*; bones of quadrupeds, partly of extinct species. Recent: All the imbedded shells, fresh water and marine, of living species, with occasional human remains and works of art (Lyell).

Geologists reckon the successive changes of the earth's crust by myriads of ages; not by arithmetical computation, but by a train of physical events, a succession of phenomena, in the animate and inanimate worlds, signs which convey to the mind more definite ideas than figures can do of the immensity of time. It will be taken for granted that throughout the whole series of geological periods and groups no manifestation of intelligence was possible so long as no being supplied with a nervous system of any kind existed, though the appetites in some manner, even in the simplest form of life, performed their function. In the earliest group, the silurian, neither plant nor animal life is found; no intelligence was possible. The nervous supply of the tribes of fishes with hard covering must have been very slight, since it can only be regarded as the most primitive beginning of animal life. Still these creatures were endowed with appetites—they fed and multiplied. The intelligence was of a grade sufficient for them to exercise these two natural, instinctive functions, and no more. These functions are necessary to the preservation of life and species,

and pervade the entire animal series, from the lowest brachiopoda to the highest vertebrata—Man. Through the long chain of transitional forms, through the transmutations and differentiations of animal life, the common conditions of *nourishment*, *reproduction*, and *self-defense* mark the progress of untold ages, from the simplest to the most complex, securing in the struggle for existence the right of the survival of the fittest. Plant life is accompanied by two of the above conditions only, namely, nourishment and reproduction. The third, self-defense, is purely animal and is exercised chiefly for the furtherance and promotion of the first two. The natural cycle of life consists of food-making and food-consuming, presenting a continuous circle of consecutive links in the chain of evolution. Starting in the inanimate world, vitalizing matter, passing through the numerous living forms that constitute the animated world (organic life), returns again to the vast ocean of the inanimate world whence it started; or we might express it thus: Minerals are converted into plants, plants into animals; man consumes all the different kinds of organic and inorganic substances, and returns at the termination of life to the mineral. During the existence of living forms innumerable phases and phenomena are exhibited. In trying to form an adequate conception of the immense periods that elapsed from the first appearance of life (determined by buried fossil remains in the Devonian group of the Primary Period) to the most recent in the Post-Tertiary, we must not lose sight of one important fact, to wit: The distance of time which separates some of the periods, groups, and eras must not be reckoned by thousands of years, but by millions of ages. We cannot fail to recognize that whatever is known of the science of geology or any other science was not revealed by God or other supernatural agency; nor could any science, art, or knowledge exist prior to

the evolution of the necessary organs, the essential experience, training, and education. Indeed, whatever the so-called sacred book may signify to Christians, and notwithstanding its ecclesiastical support or its supernatural revelation, it actually reveals nothing of practical value to humanity. Its impossible transactions, its stream of pious expressions, its semi-civilized ceremonials of worship, its semi-humanized morality, its poesy, romance, or heroism, are all directed to the regulating of the appetites, and in no sense constitute a science. The only science crudely touched upon in portions of the Bible is the medical, of which the writers had not the remotest notion, as is proved by their extravagant stories of miraculous cures.

Is it possible that throughout the vast stretch of time, embracing millions of years, while the process of evolving higher organized beings was going on, no adequate living instrument (organ, the brain) was developed; that no mind or intelligence of a higher order, no ideas or thought, existed or could exist? A nervous system just sufficient to operate the various vital functions by means of and through the five special organs of sense—merely to guide and regulate the appetites—exhibits no intelligence beyond its wants, while the higher mental phenomena are entirely absent. The geological record shows man's first appearance, by the human remains found with works of art in the Post-Tertiary Period, recent group. But man certainly had to pass through an immense experience before he discovered the art of making stone implements. When he first differentiated from his lower progenitor, he grappled with nature as best he could. He was not much above the animal in his method of searching for his nourishment, and how long a period elapsed before he called stones to his aid in self-defense and obtaining food will never be known. The degree of intelligence of our earliest progenitors was no doubt at a

low ebb, equal, however, to his wants and necessities; and his brain, as regards size, weight, capacity, and quality, was correspondingly undeveloped and uncultured.

§ 3. *When God Could Not Be.—No Intelligence Without a Nervous System. Propositions:*

(I.) 1.—Let it be granted that no intelligence can be manifested without a nervous system.

2. That there is no known substance, animate or inanimate, except living nervous matter, which possesses the power of exhibiting the phenomena of intelligence.

3. No power exists, known or knowable to man, on this planet or in the universe capable of manifesting intellectual phenomena, except brain power.

4. Mind is the direct product of the nervous organs, the brain; and mind without brain is an impossibility.

5. All intellectual processes proceed and result from brain function, and cannot be evolved by other means or produced from other source or sources.

6. The nervous system, the cerebrum, is the sole and only organ capable of culture and education; all other organs in the animal body are subordinate thereto.

7. Sensation and motion are entirely due to, and under the influence of, the nervous centers.

8. Volition, or the exercise of will, is absolutely under the direction of the nervous system.

9. No intelligent, intellectual, or living being exists or can exist without nervous power.

10. By means of the special senses and the great nerve centers, experience and education are gained both in animals and man.

(II.)—1. Animals possessing nervous systems exhibit more or less intelligence.

2. Animals provided with special senses are also

provided with nerve substance, and corresponding brain organs.

3. No impressions can be received without special senses or nerve centers of some kind.

4. Sensation and motion are common functions of animal life provided with nervous matter.

5. In the earliest stages of animal life the sensations and motions pertain almost exclusively to the appetites.

6. Perception, cognition, relation, memory, etc., are phenomena of nerve matter, and are found to a greater or lesser degree in all animals.

7. The functions and phenomena of the brain are circumscribed by the limits of the nervous system.

8. The physiological functions of organic life, presided over by the sympathetic system of nerves, are more or less uniform in all animal life. They are not under the control of the will.

9. The physiological and psychical function of intellectual life is largely regulated by the size, weight, quality, quantity, structure, and composition of the brain, or the nerve centers, the cerebrum.

(III)—1. Thought is a function of the brain and can be generated, or evolved, only through the nervous system.

2. Consciousness can be manifested only by the functions of nervous matter. Without nerve substance consciousness is impossible.

3. Without brain organs the exercise or function of the several senses is impossible—as, for example, sight, hearing, feeling, speech, etc.

4. The evolution of the higher faculties depends on the size of the cerebral hemispheres: (1) The conformation of the brain, (2) the constitution, (3) capacity, (4) climate, (5) the environment, (6) education and culture.

5. Qualities, as sagacity, identity, discrimination, communication, fear, gratitude, obedience, courage, cowardice, submissiveness, pride, vanity, etc., are to

be found more or less in all animals provided with a nervous system.

6. Qualities of a higher order, exhibited in creatures of greater brain power (man), as ideation, imagination, reflection, thought, knowledge, understanding, wisdom, etc., are phenomena due to culture and education.

7. Intellectual or mental activity of any kind or character, or the exercise of reason, cannot be carried on without brain substance physiologically and physically active.

(IV).—1. Nothing produces nothing, visible or invisible, tangible or intangible; in the imagination it remains nothing.

2. Phenomena are the result of matter in contact with matter in action or in combination.

3. Phenomena produced by vital organic matter differ, however, from phenomena produced by inanimate matter.

4. The beginning of vital activity is the commencement of life.

5. The phenomena of living matter in organic beings are similar and uniform in all living bodies, so far as the functions of organs and their structures are concerned.

6. Organs in living bodies are regulated by nerve supply. Organs of special sense, organs of general sensation, are directly in communication with the great nerve centers. The eye will cease to act when the optic nerve is impaired, and voluntary motion is impossible when the motor and sensory organs are destroyed. So it is with all the other senses.

7. The exercise of the functions of the organs of special sense, as sight, hearing, taste, and smell, or of general sensation or motion, is entirely impracticable, contrary to common sense, reason, experience, or the known laws of nature, outside a living body,

or in the absence of the organs or structures performing these functions.

8. Capacity or capability being of the same kind and equal in other respects—as to structure, composition, etc.—the greater the magnitude of a body or organ the greater the power.

9. The greater magnitude or power must contain the lesser magnitude or power, the quality being the same.

10. No communication, transmission, or conduction can take place without some tangible means or instrument, a perfectly physical process, whereby conduction, transmission, or communication may be performed.

11. Since all phenomena perceptible to the senses are products of tangible objects, an intangible body cannot communicate, conduct, or transmit that which is tangible.

12. There is no such state, thing, or being as the intangible or imperceptible, except the imaginary replica of some tangible thing, being, or state.

13. There are states and phenomena that are invisible, yet are they always more or less perceptible to one or more of the senses, invariably the result of tangible action.

14. The natural suggests (what the ancients erroneously called) the supernatural, a species of nervous phenomena; but the supernatural cannot produce the natural. A bell may produce a sound, but the sound cannot produce a bell; a body may produce a shadow, but a shadow can never produce a body. The supernatural is a phenomenon of greater brain organs, impossible in brains weighing below twenty-five or thirty ounces.

(V.)—No physiological action, function, or phenomenon can be evolved, exhibited, or manifested, except by living beings possessing all the organs of animal life, supplied with a nervous system, and exercising the primary functions of animal life, to

wit: *Nourishment, reproduction, and self-defense.* The sensations, motions, and emotions which usually accompany these natural manifestations incident to the exercise and the functions of the appetites, may be divided into groups:

1. **NOURISHMENT.** *Direct:* Pleasure, pain; contentment, discontent, happiness, or misery.

2. **REPRODUCTION.** *Direct:* Love, affection, tenderness, joy, shame, timidity, sympathy, or the opposite; excitement, jealousy, hate, passion, indignity, deceit, revenge. *Indirect:* Pride, vanity, selfishness, greed, dignity, etc.

3. **SELF-DEFENSE.** *Direct:* Courage, bravery, vindictiveness, fear, terror, endurance, choice, struggle, battle, selection, etc.

INTELLIGENCE. *Indirect (animal):* Wonder, curiosity, sagacity, attention, emulation, deliberation, imitation, gratitude, magnanimity, reason in some degree, etc.

INTELLECT (human): Truth, justice, wisdom, judgment, mercy, generosity, benevolence, knowledge, understanding, learning, conception, observation, reflection, perception.

(VI.) 1. Neither intelligence, intellectual qualities, nor mind has ever been found floating independently in the atmosphere, in space, or in the universe.

2. All animals exhibit more or less intelligence. Man is intelligent and, in consequence of having greater brain weight, has by culture acquired intellectual faculties. Mind expresses the sum-total of human intellectual capability.

3. All the intellectual products accumulated in various forms in great centers of civilization on earth are the result of man's efforts, mental labor, brain work.

4. Intellect, or knowledge acquired during the activity of human life, cannot increase after death; nor can the intelligence, or the mind, of a dead person communicate with the living, as many imagine.

5. The wealth of accumulated mental labor of any age constitutes the intellectual inheritance of the next. The last heir comes into possession of all the thoughts, ideas, and improvements acquired and experienced by his predecessors. On these he may elaborate and build, add and improve. With these he may store his memory and form conceptions or imaginations; but he cannot memorize, form a conception of, or imagine what his successors, at some remote period in the future, may learn, acquire, or experience.

§ 4. *Physical and Physiological Constituents of God.*
—When we take the trouble to read the Bible and to inquire of what constituents its God was composed, what functions he performed, and what phenomena he exhibited, we discover that his general characteristics and actions, slightly exaggerated, perhaps, were almost entirely in accord with the physical and physiological conditions of a human being. We need only consider his actions, attributes, and manifestation to convince ourselves or any reasonable person that they were very human, not as we understand humanity at this day, but as it was understood in the days when he flourished in all his glory. Let us cite a few examples which are scattered throughout the Bible and oft repeated, as follows: God created, made, formed, took, sent, brought; God said, spoke, knew, commanded, gave; God sent, finished, gathered, drove, walked, directed; God calls, sees, hears, smells, guides, leads; God curses, is angry, jealous, gives signs, scatters; God writes, makes covenants, defends, fights; God is pleased, displeased, multiplies, has mercy; God consumes, battles, hides, is provoked; God has a voice, swears, understands, judges; God thinks, remembers, reflects, is not forgetful, constructs, and destroys; God is wise, has vengeance, oppresses, is cruel, etc.; besides many other qualifications, which

we need not enumerate. What test can we apply in order to ascertain whether these attributes are supernatural? Can any man, able to exercise common sense and just a little reason, entertain for one moment the preposterous idea that the *unseen God* can possibly possess the above activities without being endowed with physical organs exercising the animal functions, and exhibiting phenomena belonging to the nervous system and the muscular organs? In the light of modern science the idea is absurd, although it might have been considered the correct thing at a time when nature was a mystery, every phenomenon a wonder, and physiological functions miraculous. Nor can we consider it strange, at a period of semi-nomadism and semi-barbarism, when mankind was as yet in a state of profound ignorance and when the wisest were exceedingly credulous and hopelessly superstitious. The unknown and inexplicable is always to the ignorant a source of wonder, fear, and superstition. But that does not prove that physical action or physiological function can be performed without a physical organization. Christians would have us believe that the Bible God exhibited all the phenomena of a living human body without its physical and anatomical structure or organs. We of to-day can no more be governed by these antiquated ideas, opinions, or notions regarding their gods, creeds, beliefs, worship, ceremonies, etc., than by their habits and customs; their political, moral, and social laws; their mechanical contrivances, agricultural, artistic, or industrial pursuits; or for their manner of traveling by sea or land, their mode of producing light, communicating by writing or printing, their way of fighting, and their numerous other systems which have been superseded by the inventions of modern times.

Is it not time that this ridiculous and antiquated system of belief and worship—this fantastical repre-

sensation of an invisible God, a supernatural being endowed with natural physiological qualities; the vicious, uncivilized, sexual production of a son, known as the Holy Trinity—was abolished? Has not the time arrived for a vigorous reformation, having for its object the discipline and governing of the conduct of humanity in conformity with modern thought, modern science, modern culture and education? In this realistic stage of civilization the fanciful plays but a minor rôle in the actualities of life. The current events as they proceed receive their practical solution, and recorded events of antiquity as they have been handed down to us are also receiving, as far as possible, a practical solution. Ancient poets and philosophers occupied their minds with fanciful speculations about their surroundings, and ingeniously endeavored, from time to time, to solve the mysterious problem of reproduction. Whatever thoughts may have induced them to create these fancies, they were nothing more than phenomena produced by brain function. Thus the phenomena believed to be supernatural, whatever form they may have assumed, are a product of the natural. All nations hold similar views of the supernatural. This product of the imagination was considered a being, a God, in whom all the essences and qualities of humanity must center and concentrate. They dressed him with all the human feelings, sentiments, and emotions. These, however, were always characteristic of the people who owned allegiance to him or whose representative he was. The culture and refinement, color and shading of the gods depended on the civilization and culture of the nation. The imaginary display of energy, activity, beauty, and grandeur reflected the energy, activity, beauty, and grandeur of the people. The ancient lived in an age of intellectual childhood, the imagination; we live in an age of mental maturity and reason.

Zeno's conception of Jove and definition of nature is perhaps the most philosophic, as it is the most poetic :

"Look up, and view the immense expanse of heaven,
The boundless Ether in his genial arms
Clasping the earth. Him callest thou
God and Jove."

§ 5. *God and Sin in the Appetites.*—*Nature*: Struggle to satisfy the appetites is the universal phenomenon pervading all living beings. All forms of life, whatsoever their nature may be, however low in structural composition, or however high in the scale of organic life, must receive, in one way or another, a quantity of suitable sustenance sufficient to maintain their vitality and to supply the ordinary working force during the period of their existence on the surface of the earth. The desire for this sustenance, or for the consumption of elementary substances, in whatsoever state it may be—whether gaseous, fluid, or solid—taken in, appropriated, or absorbed by all living organic beings—can properly be termed *appetite*. In the vegetable kingdom it is the silent, constant, even though unconscious, attempt of the plant to live, to exist, prosper or not prosper, enforcing its way, battling to retain a hold among its competitors on this earth's crust, endeavoring, in the never-ceasing contest, to demonstrate, by exhibiting its vital strength, its fitness to exist and to survive its feebler competitors. True, "appetite" is not commonly ascribed to individuals belonging to the vegetable kingdom, yet they feed, live, and propagate in a manner peculiar to their composition, structure, and organization. These fixed living forms must submit to such influence as they are brought into immediate contact with. Having no choice in selecting their natural surroundings, they absorb from their environment, elementary

substances essential to their growth and development. When the condition is favorable to any particular plant life, the plant thrives and survives; but when conditions are unfavorable, the plant sickens and perishes; *i. e.*, whenever the elements (elementary substances) light, air, moisture, soil, etc., or carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, sulphur, etc., are present in quantities sufficient to constitute the proper food for plant life, they live and flourish; but when these are absent they decay, die, and disappear. In other words, when a plant's appetite is amply satisfied, its wants supplied, it will have an ample plant vitality, with resisting force to exert in the struggle for life and being; when plant food is wanting, when plant appetite is unsatisfied, the plant must succumb by the simple process of "starvation"—plant starvation. Failing to maintain its existence by food, it follows that propagation or increase of that species or kind becomes impossible; it ceases to exist, and naturally becomes extinct. It is not, I think, difficult to understand that plants, like animals, live by what we may properly call feeding, the absorption of elementary substances, by reason of the plant appetite whereon their life and being depends. Life, therefore, primarily, consists in feeding upon the surrounding elements essential for its maintenance, and, secondarily, attaining a vital force and development to exercise the function of propagation. The sexuality in plant life is an important factor in the multiplication of the various kinds and species composing the vegetable kingdom. Plants have a parentage like animals; they develop, they have a mode of growth, a power of assimilation, the function of nutrition, an internal activity and unceasing change, like all living bodies, and a limited duration of life. Moreover plants, which are the simpler organic forms of life, convert inorganic elementary substances into organic matter, this being the first preparatory step in nature's process to

provide food for the animal kingdom. Thus, by the appetites, as every intelligent person must perceive, the functions in the lowest department of the vegetable kingdom are continued in the animal kingdom. Throughout all the transitional stages, from lower organic life to the higher, the appropriation, consumption, and assimilation of elementary substances is carried on by the same means and process. The phenomenon of life consists, in the main, of three stages—nature spinning elementary substances into life, producing organic beings, maintaining them while living, and dissolving them at the termination of their activity. The reproductive process in animal life is accomplished through the sexual appetite; the sustaining process by the digestive appetite. The whole train of human desires and passions are found represented in duplicate in the animal, just as we find the ancients endowing their gods with copies of the human passions and desires, more or less elaborated. It is the same typical picture which illustrates the round of perpetual formation and destruction, on a lower and narrower scale in the lower world of life, on a broader and greater in the higher; instinctively and automatically in the former, intelligently and systematically in the latter; without rules or regulations in the one, with customs, rules, regulations, and laws in the other; without transgressions, wrongs, crimes, or sins below a certain degree of brain growth, intelligence, or responsibility; with all responsibilities, wrongs, crimes, and sins when above a certain grade of brain weight has been attained, and where customs, rules, and moral and social laws have been adopted.

§ 6. *No Sin on Earth.*—That which is described by the word “sin,” as we understand it at the present day, is a purely human invention. It grows out of human disciplin, and taking into consideration the antiquity of man it is of comparatively recent

origin. We are well aware that with all our scientific attainments, our geological discoveries, our advance in civilization, and our progress in knowledge generally we have thus far been unable to fix any precise date when, in the earliest stage of his existence, man was just a remove above the brute; but at that remote period, when he differed but slightly from his brute progenitors—when man was in his very primitive state—*there was no sin on earth.* Man at that time knew no more of sin than any other animal inhabiting the surface of the globe. No one ever ventures to attribute sin to animals, to brute man, savage or barbarian, or applies the term to any being except civilized man; and it is attributed to him only when he has acquired a degree of intelligence that places him far above the brute. Sin is not imputable to children until, through discipline and culture, they have arrived at an age of discretion and understanding. There are civilized beings so exalted as to fancy themselves exempt from sin, as, for example, emperors, kings, popes, and high ecclesiastical dignitaries. The ordinary run of cultured men, above the animal and below monarchs, popes, etc., are prone to transgress and sin. At the beginning of the Christian era, Horace, anticipating scientific knowledge, sagaciously remarks: "When manlike animals first crept forth from the newly formed earth, a dumb and filthy herd, they fought for acorns and lurking places with their nails and fists, then with clubs, and last with arms, which, taught by experience, they had forged." How true is his almost prophetic statement. That it coincides with modern discoveries, modern scientists bear testimony. Had primitive savage man any knowledge of right or wrong, of sin or vice, as we conceive of sin and right or wrong? Certainly not. Animal force, muscular strength, trial by battle, determined the right by establishing superiority. There was unquestionably a period in man's existence

which we may term the reign of animal-man, rude, untutored, uncultured, inexperienced, uncivilized, uneducated; without society, morals, government, discipline, or laws; without heaven, hell, or sin; without God, worship, prayer, or blessing. These phases of civilization had not yet been evolved, the regulation of human conduct was not prescribed, nor had the higher characteristics been developed. The powers of observation, of discernment and discrimination, were very limited. Man was unable to realize his own brute condition; the want of greater experience made him just what he was. He represented, at that very remote geological period, the highest type of brute-man, just beginning to feel his superiority over all other animals. 1. To commit an act that is forbidden is to do a wrong, but where it is not forbidden no wrong can be done. 2. A rule not in existence cannot be broken, nor can a law be violated that has never been enacted. 3. No language or art which has never been acquired can be used.

No fixed customs, rules, or laws regulated the appetites of primitive man. No sin nor crime, therefore, existed. When customs, rules, or laws were established, sin and crime entered the world. Rules and law multiply as civilization advances, and sins, crimes and wrong-doings multiply in proportion. Rules and laws are never enacted or enforced except when someone experiences the necessity for them. Sins differ from crimes; crimes are sins, but sins are not crimes. The sin of impiety is not a crime in law. Sexual crimes within the law are sins, which the law punishes, and the church forgives. Sexual wrongs without the range of the law are sins, which the church condones. The production of sin, therefore, is dependent on two conditions chiefly: 1st, The evolution of ecclesiastical laws, and, 2d, the enactment of the civil laws.

§ 7. *Animals and Men Forced to Exert Themselves to Supply Their Appetites.*—When in any part of the globe we behold nature in its pristine state, uncultivated and untouched by the hand of man, we say that, however grand it may appear to an artistic eye, it looks wild. It appears thus to us in contradistinction to that condition in which nature has undergone a series of changes, due to intelligent, skillful labor, and to the attention of man. Nature in this wild state presents all those phenomena of living matter, as the elements under ordinary or extraordinary influences, chemical, electrical, dynamic, etc., composed, formed, evolved, and produced at different geological periods on the earth's surface. Whatever form elementary matter may assume, plant, animal, or other, it is a product of this terrestrial globe and in its primitive state is termed wild by man civilized. For that reason we must not lose sight of the fact that, whatsoever is observed on this globe, whether elemental or manifested through the vital mechanism of plant, animal, or man; however complicated the phase or phenomenon physical bodies exhibit; be it the odor of a flower or the thought of a mind, is a natural product, just as much as clouds, thunderstorms, earthquakes, etc. The natural changes and modifications living beings undergo bring about greater or lesser states of perfection, the result of the struggle for existence, natural selection, and the survival of the fittest. Man in his natural state, whether of remote antiquity or of our own time, takes cognizance of his surroundings as he finds them, and he discriminates the state or condition as he perceives it, according to the amount of experience he has had. Man is seldom in advance of his immediate environments; his progress and mental conditions are necessarily in harmony with the media by which his sensations are produced.

Savage man perceives nothing incongruous in his

wild and uncultivated surroundings. Experience teaches him how to manipulate the material at hand, differentiating and utilizing all that is within his reach, and searching out and selecting such substances as may supply either his wants or his necessities. Both animals and man are forced to exert their instinctive faculties—by their will power they must exercise a degree of activity—for their own preservation. The experience gained by the exertion is for what? The main purpose is to obtain sustenance to supply *the appetite*. The appetites must be satisfied, or cease to exist. Primitive man—man of antiquity, wild, savage, barbarous—is such to us by reason of our own experience, culture, and improvement. We must not forget, however, that though we are very many removes from the savage state, we have attained our high state of civilization through accumulated experience, by our own efforts, our own energy, by human culture and education, and not by any supernatural means or divine aid.

The same differences which we find between ourselves, as cultivated beings, and man in the wild state, we also find in everything around us. The primitive forest and rock, mountain and valley, have undergone transformation in harmony with our own state, converting them into cities, parks, etc., by degrees and in the same ratio that we ourselves have been intellectually transformed. As man improves and progresses his surroundings improve and progress. Isolated instances may occur where individuals retrogress, but on the whole we move steadily forward. The notion that man *degenerated* from a primeval state of superior intelligence, or that at any period of his existence he was supernaturally endowed with higher wisdom, profound knowledge, or cultured intelligence is absurd; nay, it is contrary to reason, opposed to reason, and altogether false. It might as well be claimed that science has been supernaturally communicated. The biblical as-

sumption of man's degeneration has been demonstrated to be untrue, because whatever man has acquired or possesses has been won by himself, and by no other agency. The original stock of mankind was at no time endowed with superior intellectual powers, nor inspired with any special knowledge. Our ancestors had no idea of the modern sciences, nor had Moses any knowledge of electricity, as Rabbi Wise claims. No, not even Jehovah, nor any one then living. The necessary faculties were not yet developed; culture and education were not far enough advanced; the hereditary endowments did not yet exist. Had the ancients possessed the same improvable nature as their posterity the point of advancement reached ere this would have been immeasurably higher.

§ 8. *Rules Regulating Conduct.*—When men first realized the necessity of adopting crude rules of conduct or behavior, it is impossible to ascertain. The rules earliest adopted and put in practice consisted, in all probability, of a primitive family discipline, an obligatory obedience of children to parents, elders, patriarchs, etc. The primary duties would be enforced and punishment meted out in a savage way for any disobedience, as is even now the practice in families, savage or civilized. Parental family jurisdiction formed, no doubt, the nucleus, around which customs and habits were formed. These spread and extended into groups and family unions, tribes, races, etc. The discipline and correction, duty and obedience, which began to be practiced and enacted in the family circle were carried forward on an ampler scale into communities, of course always subject to such changes and modifications as the slowly-growing civilization found practicable, necessary, or convenient. It is obvious that the man of antiquity did not start with a high grade of civilization, equipped with knowledge, or endowed with great

mental powers. He began with instinctive animal faculties, and had to pass through an immense series of changes, step by step, to higher degrees of culture. It is hard to conceive how culture and civilization began and progressed during the earliest ages. Starting, as primitive man did, at a plane just above that of the brute, he naturally carried along with him many remnants of animal practices, such, for example, as were in force during biblical times, through the middle ages, and some of which survive even in our own times. Discipline, duty, and obedience form the basis of culture and of moral and social obligation, and pertain chiefly and manifestly to the regulation of the conduct of man as influenced by his appetites. The abolition or prohibition of such animal practices as cannibalism, human sacrifices, promiscuous sexual intercourse, etc., traces of which are still found among savage races, was an important step in a human direction. We have already seen that supplying the wants of animal life consists in satisfying the appetites, and that this is the principal task and occupation of the animal, which accomplishes it instinctively; but man, in consequence of his superior intelligence, adopted rules of conduct in addition. We must keep in sight the very important fact that from the moment reformation began, by the contriving of rules, man continued slowly to improve, and that the same mental process which induced him to adopt rules stimulated him to formulate all that are known at the present time to the highest civilized being. On every line of thought, sacred or otherwise, moral or political, in the realm of the imagination, of science, of mechanics, or of industry, man fashioned and forged his ideas, abstract or practical, in harmony with his own state, with the period in which he lived, and with the degree of progress his mental faculties had attained. Man was never in advance of his time, except in isolated instances, though he has

been continually curbed, checked, and drawn backward by an antiquated system of ecclesiastical discipline. He has made progress by forcing his way forward, growing intellectually in spite of church and creed. Man's accomplishments bear the impress of his age in the improvement and progress made. We must remember that nothing of an intellectual character can be perceived or evolved, conceived or portrayed, except through brain substance, and that all mental achievements, however subtle, refined or mysterious, exaggerated or colored, are within the bounds of our own attainment, and never beyond.

§ 9. *When Man First Emerged from the Brute State.*—We have to take immense leaps in the age and history of mankind. The man of antiquity did not begin, geologically speaking, at the stone age, but at a remote period of which we know nothing. We have no means of even guessing the time that elapsed between brute-man and the man of the stone age. Presumably man had no knowledge of sin at the stone age; the time had not arrived when he found it necessary to place restrictions or limits on his appetites or indulgences. He ate his fill when he could obtain it and procreated whenever passion or inclination suggested. Later, limits and restrictions, rules and laws, adopted concerning the regulation of the appetites and all acts contributing thereto, obedience or disobedience to the customs generally practiced, gave rise to what was considered right and wrong. A few thousand years ago, when ancestors had developed into gods, turf mounds and stone heaps into altars, ceremonies of veneration of the dead into worship, nature adoration into sacrifices, etc., wrong became acknowledged, and then was coined the word "sin," having direct or indirect reference to the appetites. History throws very little light upon the earliest state of man, and the

myths, legends, and fables handed down to us are utterly unreliable. The records we have give us accounts of only the most recent of human events. Whatever idea the ancients had, however they symbolized natural phenomena, interpreted or misinterpreted phases of life, it was human—either ignorance or error, intelligence or genius—and was elaborated out of the appetites. Sin is supposed to be mainly of biblical origin, probably adopted from other notions or traditions. Theologians consider sin to be the evil of human nature, or moral defect or perversion; an inherent quality of the human will in a greater or less degree unavoidably characterizing it in this life. But theologians, ancient and modern, misconceive “human nature;” otherwise they would know that it is so many degrees more advanced than brute nature, solely because it is in the stage of higher endowments and culture. They forget that the same appetites that preserve the animal preserve man. The difference lies almost exclusively in the manner and method adopted in the preservation of life, and is more or less marked according to the kind of intelligence and the degree of culture attainable or attained. The beginning and the end are the same in both; the modes of existence alone differ. Man was thoroughly imbued with the fact of his own superior physical condition and natural supremacy. When he had acquired sufficient mental power to form his primary conception of deities in the powers of nature—which conception succeeded ancestor worship, etc.—he reflected himself in his gods as in a mirror, including his passions and his appetites. The ancients portrayed their God in the littleness of themselves, somewhat exalted perhaps, but generally with similar characteristics and appetites. They began with the births and marriages of the gods (when the idea of civilized marriage had developed), investing them with all the human frailties, desires, passions, and emo-

tions—the appetites and their extravagances. The mythological gods, barbarian or pagan, whose characteristics are celebrated, have long since been discarded and are in modern times represented in comic opera. The Hebrew-Christian God, the ancestral Jehovah, is the legitimate, modified, and centralized successor of the mythological gods. It was a metamorphosis of many gods into one, retaining the physical aptitudes and appetites, without the physical embodiment. The theologico-metaphysical abstract notion of Jehovah-God is an advance on the mythological notion; though Christianity, while adopting in part the abstract idea, never entirely relinquished the physical attributes—namely, the digestive and generative functions of their deity.

§ 10. *Adoption of Gods by Inheritance.*—Theism is co-extensive with religion and worship, including all forms of polytheism, pantheism, and all the varieties of monotheism; and may be said to denote the genus of which polytheism, pantheism, monotheism, etc., are species. How these conceptions originated we shall in all probability never know, yet they indicated a state of civilization. As to the form of primitive theism, we do not know whether it was a pretended belief in the existence of a god that made all things and sustained and governed them, yet denying that he had any regard to moral distinctions, these being merely the product of human will and law; whether it was a belief in the being, the natural attributes, the providence, to some extent the moral attributes, and finally the government of God, but with a denial of the immortality of the soul and a future state of rewards and punishments; whether it was belief in a being of natural and moral perfection, in the providence of God, the immortality of the soul, and a future state of rewards and punishments, yet accepting only what is discoverable by the light of nature, without believing; or whether it was a

belief in some other of the numerous modifications of the god ideas. Language is much older than any statement in language, but language by no means carries us back to primitive man, or even to the historical origin of the idea of deity. Science has been able to demonstrate in part that the prehistoric Assyrian, Semitic, Turanian, and Hematic languages each arose out of a still earlier prehistoric language which also had words expressing ideas of a supernatural being. There may be in the abyss of unrecorded time many strata of language buried too deep for human excavation. Language must be older than the gods, for analysis of existing languages cannot disclose the name of the oldest deity or the historical origin of the idea of deity. Geology shows the vast antiquity of man, but ideas of the divine were probably invented many ages before Aryan, Semitic, or any other known word of God. The numerous gods handed down to us, and their prehistoric modifications, had again other and other prehistoric prototypes. We may thus trace back the modern gods to the remotest antiquity, to prehistoric and ancestral gods; for gods had ancestors, and these god ancestors had remoter ancestors—to a period when man had no gods and little or no language. As civilization has progressed the general tendency has been, as it is even now, more or less, among all nations, to purify ancestral gods, and to substitute spirit worship. The inherited remnant of pantheism, polytheism, and monotheism is the monotheistic, Jehovistic, trinitarian Christianity.

§ 11. *To the Struggle of the Gods* of different peoples for national supremacy at one period of man's progress toward civilization, history bears witness. The idea of retaining their allegiance and submissiveness to their leaders, generals, or governors was an important factor in the discipline of the masses. The bond of national union was the God, and this

was the only cohesive principle known. The people were not yet intelligent enough to entertain any other sentiment than fear of the divinity, and the application of brute force seemed necessary to stimulate them to activity and to encourage their national pride. The common boast of the ruling powers was the greatness, skill, and wisdom of their respective gods, whom they bombastically praised. The Assyrians, for example, showed marked preference for Asshur, designating him "King of all the gods," "He who rules supreme over all the gods." Nebuchadnezzar showed partiality for the god Mero-dach, and applied exclusively to him such magnificent titles as "The lord of all beings," "The lord of the house of gods," "The lord of lords," "The lord of the gods," "The king of heaven and earth." Nabonidas, on the other hand, especially revered Sin, the moon-god, and represented him as the "great divinity," "the king of gods upon gods," the "chief and king of the gods of heaven and earth." Moses (Exodus xv, 2, 3): "The Lord is my strength," "The Lord is a man of war;" (x), "For I thy Lord am a jealous God," etc.; Joshua (xxii, 22): "The Lord God of gods." David (Psalms xxiv, 1): "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; (xlvii, 2), "For the Lord most high is terrible; he is a great king over all the earth; (lxxxviii, 1), "Lord God of salvation;" (lxxxiv, 1), "Lord of hosts;" (xcii, 1), "Most high," etc. These titles describe the qualifications assigned to the divinities to which they are attached with the intent to exalt and magnify. Each nation, in the struggle for self-preservation, made every effort to show the superiority of its own adopted deity. The God of the Old Testament in a modified form became the God of the New. There is no comparison between the modern philosophical Christian God and the old God of the Jews, of which the former is a highly civilized modification. Jehovah was not an enlightened, refined, or philosophi-

cal God ; he had his moods, passions, tastes, desires, and whims ; essentially a God of appetites, possessing all the physical senses, but no body. His worshipers endowed him with the functions of all the senses, but with no organs or anatomical structure. As a political adviser and champion of the people, he is made to speak and act through leaders, generals, kings, etc. Gods cannot think without brain, nor can they be wise, nor have intellect, nor command, nor be good, nor be merciful, nor be angry, nor be jealous, nor speak, nor taste, nor smell, hear, or see ; these attributes can be exercised only by big-brained, cultivated, educated creatures, *i. e.*, men. Whatever our ancestors worshiped, the ancients imagined, the man of antiquity thought, or primitive man knew, is to us no criterion of correctness or truth. All their opinions were simply opinions of their time ; they accepted certain teachings and beliefs, taking all for granted, because they knew no better. In no instance, biblical or historical, do we find the god or gods more advanced than the people they represented. These Theistic or Polytheistic systems of thought may be regarded as a preparatory school for higher mental culture—a stepping-stone from a lower to a more elevated civilization. All nations without exception passed through the same or similar mental evolutions, progress being made grade by grade, slowly but surely, toward a superior state for humanity.

The Hebrews did not take kindly to Jehovah ; they were coerced, driven, and whipped into the belief in him. Exodus (xxxiii, 27) gives us a fair example, when three thousand idolaters were killed—a very drastic measure for God. Jehovah never selected his people ; he could not. The nation, through their leaders, selected El, Jehovah. They adopted him as their God, and his persistence over other gods may be said to be purely accidental, as

one of the human possibilities, an inherited remnant of past experience.

§ 12 *Sacrificial Appetites*.—The sacrifices, or feeding of the gods, were similar among all ancient people; they conceived the notion that their divinities required appetizing morsels, and that they were not only pleased by being thus amply provided for, but were highly gratified with the ceremonious attention they received. The gods were very fastidious; they had sacrificial preferences, as kids, goats, bullocks, etc. Jehovah seems to have been very particular about the blood and fat; (Leviticus xvii, 6) "And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and burn the fat for a sweet savor unto the Lord." (7) "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring," etc. The relation between the people and God was as natural as that of son to father; it did not rest upon observances of the conditions of a pact. But it was not on that account always equally lively and hearty. Jehovah was regarded as having varieties of moods. To procure and retain his favor, sacrifices were useful; by them prayer and thanksgiving were seconded. Jehovah, or those who represented him, knew his business, and would stand no nonsense. Thus, Numbers xxv, 3, 4: "And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor [a rival God], and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel." "And the Lord said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the Lord against the sun, that the fierce anger of the Lord may be turned away from Israel." (5) "And Moses said unto the judges of Israel, slay ye everyone his man that were joined unto Baal-peor." (8) "And he [Phinehas, Aaron's grandson,] went after the man of Israel into the tent, and thrust both of them through, the man of Israel, and the wo-

man through her belly;" "twenty-four thousand died." (13) God rewarded Phinehas for his zeal with everlasting priesthood. The men of Judah in the last ages of the kingdom were wont to propitiate by sacrifice of their own children to Molech (1 Kings xi, 7). "That no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech" (2 Kings xxiii, 10; Jer. xxxiii, 35). Human sacrifices were common to Semitic heathenism, and at least the idea of such sacrifices was not unknown to Israel in early times (for examples; Isaac, Jephthah's daughter, etc.). The barbarous practice of human sacrifice was the almost universal custom among all nations. Children were sacrificed; the Persians buried people alive; Amestris, the wife of Xerxes, is said to have entombed twelve persons for the good of her soul. The Pelasgi in time of scarcity vowed the tenth of all that should be born to them for a sacrifice, in order to procure plenty. Aristomenes, the Mesenian, slew three hundred noble Lacedemonians at the altar of Jupiter at Ithome. The Romans, the Gauls, the Germans, the Druids, etc., all practiced human sacrifices, more or less barbarous. The Bible prohibits human sacrifices, yet the practice of killing innocent people to appease the anger of Jehovah, or to please him, is indulged in. The practice was discontinued, of necessity, by the growth of intelligence and advancing civilization; brute sacrifice replaced the human, and animals of all kinds were sacrificed to please and satisfy the gods, Jehovah in particular. With the dawn of the Christian era, both systems were rejected. Gods, sacrifices, worship, ceremonies, etc., keeping pace with the general progress of man, were subjected to the change, modification, and improvement of which these as well as all other human inventions are susceptible. It is the inevitable tendency in nature, human nature especially, that the new must supersede the old, and that the old must yield to the new. The past suited the past, being

adaptable to the conditions of the past, but it is unsuited for the present, and not adaptable to our modern conditions. Jehovah was molded to suit the nations of antiquity, their tastes, inclinations, and practices, their condition, circumstances, culture, and degree of civilization. He was accommodating; he encouraged their appetites, gastronomic and sexual—the sexual in keeping with the times and customs generally. When the Lord sent the Israelites to take vengeance on the Midianites (Numbers xxxi, 2, 7), “They warred against the Midianites,” etc.; “they slew the kings, five in number, and all the adult males, burnt the cities, took all the spoils, women and children.” But they “sinned against the Lord.” Why? Verses 17 and 18 explain: “Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known a man by lying with him. But all the woman children that have not known a man by lying with him keep alive for yourselves.” The Lord God was not always in the same mood; his inclination and humor were subject to changes. In the battle of Jahaz Sihon, king of Heshbon, (Deut. ii, 30–34), “And we took all his cities at that time, and utterly destroyed the men, and the women, and the little ones, of every city, we left none to remain.” Were these barbarous transactions God’s or the people’s? Is it not evident that the people resembled God and God the people—Jehovah being the God, indicative of their national idea, their actions and customs? Indeed, they could not make their Jehovah other than they did. Of necessity he must correspond and harmonize with his people in culture and intelligence, in their mental development, understanding, customs, and habits. When he tells them to increase and multiply like the sand of the sea it proves to them a very pleasing occupation. That industry thrived, though reason, judgment, and humanity were wanting, both in God and the people. Their reasoning faculties were not yet

developed. God in his impulsive moods had no reason, because the people had none, and their God could not possess a greater mind than the greatest mind of that period.

§ 13. *Christians and Theologians Marvel* that all races and peoples, savage, barbarous, or civilized, should hold similar notions concerning ancestral worship, spirits, gods, etc., but in truth there is nothing surprising nor wonderful about it. It is inevitable to the process and formation of mind, the course of development of the mental faculties. Mankind experience, think, imagine, know, and understand alike during certain stages of progress in proportion to the force and power exercised in the struggle for self-preservation and the kind and amount of culture received. The conception of phenomena, things, and beings must necessarily harmonize and correspond to the accumulated experience and knowledge. The fact that the gods corresponded to the ages in which they flourished accounts for the gods of one age being unsuited to another more advanced. The uncivilized gods were mainly such owing to misconceptions of nature; therefore is it that as actual truths and facts were recognized and man became more human, the gods also became more humane; not opposed to nature, or supernatural, but in accord with and approaching nearer and nearer to nature.

Ecclesiastical scholars make it their special business to interpret scriptural writings by a special method, for which they are educated. According to their biassed notions and accepted creeds they put meanings into acts and sayings difficult to discover by modern students. The infection of skepticism has penetrated even the theological ranks, causing dissensions, quarrels, and prosecutions. As regards the sanctity, holiness, or veneration in which gods, things, or beings were or are held by any race,

nation, or people, it depended and now depends upon the customs inherited, the culture enjoyed, and the kind of education prevalent. To the child it makes no difference that a religious creed or worship is good, bad, or indifferent, or altogether absent. The child imbibes whatever kind of theological pabulum is administered to it. The great nerve centers, the brain, etc., will develop the faculties to any bias, prejudice, or superstition, and build up the mind on such educational material as is provided for them by those who have the children in charge. The educational method and system changes radically from generation to generation, century to century, age to age; ideas and opinions also change, and so do our thoughts and observing power. What the people thought and observed two or three thousand years ago depended on their culture and education just as in our own time. The idolatrous, pantheistic, polytheistic, monotheistic, or any other system, was just as important in its day as trinitarianism is among Christians now. The adherents of these systems no doubt faithfully believed what they saw, heard, or even imagined, their visions, miracles, and wonders included. The densely ignorant, oppressed, and slavish masses readily submitted or were forced to submit to any priestly command, such commands being by them deemed oracular. When we judge our biblical ancestors, considering first their doings and actual transactions as we find them described, measuring and analyzing them by our own moral and social standard, and by the scientific light we have acquired, we find ourselves so vastly superior to them in mind, skill, ingenuity, and civilization, and in the development of our senses and faculties, that we are well able to weigh, estimate, or interpret with considerable accuracy all they taught, imagined, or produced, either in biblical or any other time. Men no longer rely on theological specialists to interpret scriptural

fable and fiction, or historical facts. Ordinarily educated persons of to-day, exercising their reason and common sense, can distinguish between biblical savagery and barbarism and cultured refinement and humanity.

§ 14. *Common Resemblance.*—As the Eastern nations, with but slight variations, moved in the same general groove of culture, we are able to ascertain with considerable accuracy the actual state of affairs in any stage in the civilizing progress and mental process. Judging from the facts before us, the Hebrews did not acquire the higher culture until after their captivity. In the industrial arts they were behind other neighboring nations. The Persians and Greeks especially were far in advance of the Hebrews, both in arts and sciences. Even the Phenicians and Canaanites were superior to them; nor were they one whit better than their kinsfolk, the Moabites, the Ammonites, and Edomites, the elder Hebrew branch of the group. What was their condition prior to their return from the Babylonian captivity? The character of the entire series of religious personalities throughout the period of the Judges and the Kings—from Deborah, who caused Jael's treacherous act of murder, to David, who caused his prisoners of war to be sawn asunder and burnt—makes it very difficult to believe that the religion of Israel was from the outset one of especially moral character. On the contrary, biblical testimony to their barbarous practices clearly shows that brute force dominated all their acts, and that their leading motive consisted mainly in self-preservation, fighting their kinsfolk and neighbors, and satisfying their appetites. In dominant thought, Jehovah, their God, was made to assume the role of political leader and social dictator, commanding for his pleasure the commission of all sorts of atrocities, and punishing for disobedience. The God of Israel

(which means "El does battle") was the deification of the qualities and attributes of the people themselves. He was just so far in advance of the masses as the leaders who conceived, evolved, and presented him were, and no farther. The development and progress of Jehovah moves always in parallel lines with the acquired mental faculties of the nation whom he represents. As before remarked, we have advanced far enough in mental science and have become experts to a sufficient degree to measure the amount and kind of knowledge of any race, nation, or individual; and we do not find it at all difficult at the present time *to insert an intellectual thermometer into the mind of the God, Jehovah, and ascertain with some degree of precision the quality and quantity of learning or wisdom the God possessed.* As the God, so the people, and as the people, so the God, is an invariable rule. The gods grew better, wiser, and more moral as the thinking man of the age discovered the evils that beset them and agitated for improvement and reformation of both gods and people. Jehovah was the warrior El, after the nation which had assumed the name. The leaders, generals, priests, prophets, or kings spoke and acted in his name, and the business of the nation was conducted in the corporate name of Jehovah the Lord God. At no period and in no place do we find Jehovah in a higher role than that of the highest mental attainment of the nation. He was equal to the prevailing cult, not only of the Hebrew nation, but of others belonging to the same group. The Hebrews were not the only monotheistic people; Moab, Ammon, Edom, etc., were equally monotheistic. How they came to that notion we do not exactly know; in all probability it was adopted from other monotheistic nations. It is interesting to note the character changes in Jehovah. When the people were nomads, pastoral, semi-civilized in customs and habits, God assumed the same general charac-

teristics. When, by their learning the culture of the Canaanites, tilling the soil, and husbandry, an advance in civilization was made, Jehovah, their God, also advanced; both the people and their Lord God progressed from the nomadic-pastoral to the agricultural stage. Both God and the people comprehended the fact that corn, wine, olives, and figs were the necessities of life. These benefits led them also to adopt the divinities worshiped by the Canaanite peasants as the givers of food. The apostasy to Baal, whom the Greeks identified with Dionysius, was not surprising, especially on the part of the first generation that quitted the wilderness and adopted a settled agricultural life—a change which is attested alike by historical and prophetic traditions. Doubtless Baal, as the god of the land of Canaan, and Jehovah, as the God of the people of Israel, were in the first instance co-ordinated. We are led by our theological teachers to believe that Jehovah was the sole monotheistic deity, and always represented a monotheistic principle, but that is not so. The truth is apparent that at one time *Canaan and Baal represented the female and Jehovah and Israel the male principle of the union.*

§ 15. *Bible Sins and Punishments.*—Let us examine the great biblical sins as recorded, and try to discover how much humanity or civilization they exhibit. Thus, Exodus xxxv, 2, 3, “Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you a holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation upon the sabbath day.” If this sabbath law was ever put into practice, and evidently it was, nothing more savage or barbarous is to be found in the history of any nation. Imagine a man being put to death, or stoned to death, for not resting on the Sabbath? These and similar laws have given Chris-

tian law-makers an excuse and a license to make laws equally severe, in ancient and modern times. "The first Christian emperor made a law by which seduction was punished with death; if the female gave her own consent she also was punished with death; if the parents endeavored to screen the criminals they were banished, and their estates were confiscated; the slaves who might be accessory were burnt alive, or forced to swallow molten lead; the very offspring of an illegal love were involved in the consequences of the sentence" (Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, vol. ii, page 210). Burning at the stake for slight differences of opinion and to establish Christian dogmas and creeds is of only recent occurrence, as is also hanging for sheep-stealing in England. Kindling a fire on the Sabbath is accounted a sin even to this day among orthodox Jews, but evidently the compilers, or editors, or composers of the law, including Jehovah, had no geographical knowledge, for such a law is adapted for only warm climates; were people in cold climates to obey it, they would be very likely to freeze to death.

No part of scriptural literature has elicited so much admiration, wonder, and veneration from the Christian world as the Ten Commandments. It is even claimed that they form the basis of all laws. The Decalogue, like all other Jewish literature, was collected, compiled, and edited, and the name of some ancient worthy, as Moses, Joshua, David, or Solomon, given as its author. Modern scholars are very doubtful that Moses was the originator of the Decalogue, and it is moreover declared that the doctrine is not Mosaic at all. Critics of almost every school seem to have arrived at the conclusion that portions of the Decalogue, the precepts of probity especially, were of a pre-Mosaic origin; but that is mere conjecture. We are not particularly concerned when the Pentateuch was written or by whom, or

whether it is pre- or post-exilic. Students and critics ask, "Did the whole text of the Decalogue (Ex. xx, 2-17) stand upon the tablets of stone?" The Ten Commandments, or the ten precepts, are of two kinds. On the first table we find five precepts of piety; on the second table five precepts of probity. The five precepts of probity we claim to be of a pre-Mosaic origin. Those on the first table, containing the five precepts of piety, are chiefly concerning God: Thou shalt have no other God; make no graven images, nor bow down to them, etc. The second table contains the five precepts of probity: Honor thy father and mother; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness, etc. The second tablet (Ex. xxxiv, 12, 16, *et seq.*) contains ten precepts with considerable variation, some serving explanatory purposes. In Deuteronomy (v. 7-21), we have a repetition of the Decalogue more or less modified. Here the precepts of piety are mainly directed to maintaining Jehovah's supremacy over rival gods.

It is further urged that Moses could not have prohibited the worship of images, for subsequent history shows us a descendant of Moses officiating as a priest in the idolatrous sanctuary of Dan. It is very doubtful whether the five precepts of piety were in existence prior to Ezra's return to Jerusalem, or Nehemiah's governorship (446-444 B.C.), or the precepts of probity as we find them embodied in what became under Ezra and Nehemiah the *Magna Charter of Judaism*. Some writers maintain that there are distinct indications that these tablets were not put together until after the return of the tribes of Israel from exile under their respective leaders. These contradictory statements as to who wrote the Commandments—whether God, Moses, or the collectors of the numerous fragments which make the collection that enter into the composition of the Bible—are not surprising. Exodus

xxxiv, 1, says: "And the Lord said unto Moses, 'Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest.'" (27) "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. (28) And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights, he did neither eat bread nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the Ten Commandments." Exodus xxxi, 18: "And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tablets of testimony, tablets of stone, written with the finger of God." Compare Tablets I, Ex. xx, Tablets II, Ex. xxxiv, and Deut. v. Read these tablets carefully, compare the words, then exercise your own common sense and reason, and draw your own conclusion.

The Decalogue teaches nothing. Whether the codifier of the Decalogue perceived any contradiction or discrepancy in these different statements is not ascertainable, but with all due deference to our Christian friends skeptics may inquire how it comes that the texts of the two tablets should vary so extensively as they do. The words were to be the same on the *second* tablet as those on the *first*. Whose memory was at fault? God's, Moses', or the scribes' and editors'? The second difficulty we encounter as to who wrote on these tablets of stone is still more serious. 1. Did God write on the tablets which he instructed Moses to hew? 2. Did Moses write as the Lord told him? 3. Was Moses with the Lord forty days and forty nights, and did he write the tablets? 4. Did God give the two tablets to Moses written by his own finger? Theologians should be able to reconcile these conflicting statements. Modern scholars are of the opinion that neither God nor Moses wrote the commands, but

that they were collected, composed, and edited by the priestly order under the supervision of Ezra and Nehemiah? That we are met by serious difficulties is self-evident. That the precepts in Exodus xxxiv number exactly ten is by no means clearly made out, and the individual precepts are variously assigned by different critics; while the latest supporters of the ten theory admit that the original number is now concealed by additions. The Decalogue contains no precepts of social morality, but forms a sort of unsystematic abstract of the oldest laws about points of religious observance. If such a system of precepts was ever viewed as a basis of the covenant of Israel, it must belong to a far earlier stage of religious development than can be assigned to Exodus xx. We cannot fail to perceive that the five precepts of piety teach nothing, and that the five precepts of probity are entirely inadequate. The precepts of probity were the natural outgrowth of moral and social necessities and exigencies. Self-preservation and mutual protection are the fundamentals of law and order. The national development of the people depended on them, and in their absence no security for either life or property could exist. The most important incidents in the lives of our ancestors, and in the careers of their gods, heroes, leaders, priests, etc., their battles and struggles, are preserved in the memory of men mainly by legends, or find expression in song, handed down by word of mouth only. The culture of Jehovah and his people not being of a high order, the precepts of piety and religious observances were of a barbarous and tyrannical order. They did not assume a civilized form until the appearance of the prophets, when considerable of Jehovah's bumptiousness and physical bluster was toned down—and still more so with Ezra's reformation. The more refined cult was ushered in with the dawn of the literary age. Elijah and Elisha committed nothing to writing. Theirs

was still a non-literary age. Amos, a century later, is credited with being an author. A greater probability, however, exists that Hebrew literature began its career after the return of the captives under Ezra, bringing with them a higher civilization, the benefits of the Babylonian school.

§ 16. *Gifts and Sacrifices*.—All ancient and primitive nations habitually approached their gods with gifts, and the presentation of the gifts, being the central feature in every ordinary act of worship, was regarded as the sacrifice proper. In all parts of the world the stated gifts by which the gods were honored in private worship, or public feasts, are drawn from the stores on which human life is supported—fruits, grain, wine, oil, flesh of animals, and the like. Religion united God to a definite circle. The deity is regarded as a king, or if several gods are worshiped by the same circle, they are the lords and ladies and naturally to be honored in the same way as earthly grandees. Thus among the Hebrews, whose early institutions afford a typical example of a national religion, the fundamental rule is that no one is to appear before Jehovah (Ex. xxiii, 16) empty handed, just as it would be indecent (and in the East is still indecent) to approach a king or great man without some present, however trifling. In like manner Homer teaches that gods and kings alike are persuaded by gifts.

In almost all nations we find that the chief sacrificial feast is associated with the harvest and the vintage, or, where pastoral life predominates, is regulated by the time at which flocks bear their young. (The offering of firstlings as religious sacrifices was an ancient custom among the Arabs, as was also the offering of the first fruits of the field and vintage among the Canaanites and all other nations as an expression of thankfulness to their gods—customs which were later incorporated by

the Hebrew, modified according to circumstances and advancing civilization. In biblical language, these customs were transformed into the Passover. The eating of unleavened cakes is not of Mosaic origin, but an adaptation of natural usages prevalent among nations or peoples of greater antiquity. The old sacrificial spring feasts, like the Arabaic feasts of Rajab, were later centralized and elaborated as national feasts.) At these seasons of firstlings homage is paid to the gods of the good things which they themselves have given to the inhabitants of the land. This conception of sacrifices may subsist with many and various views of the nature of the gods and of religion. It may subsist with the idea that the god has need of the worshiper and his gifts, just as the worshiper has need of the god and his help; and thus, with a matter-of-fact, business-like people like the Romans, religion may become very much a sort of bargain struck with the gods. In general, we find an extraordinary persistence of the notion that sacrifices do in some way afford a physical satisfaction to the deity. If they do not *feed* him, he is at least gratified by their odor. Among the Semites, for example, sacrifices were not originally burned. The god was not seated aloft, but was present at the place of sacrifice, inhabiting a sacred stone (a bactylum, beth-el, or "house of God"), which answered at once to the later idol and the latter altar. The gift of the worshipers was not, in the more primitive cult, consumed by fire, but the sacred stone was smeared with oil or blood; libations of milk, of blood, or of wine were poured forth beside it; cereal gifts were presented by being simply laid on the sacred ground, and slaughtered victims were left there to be devoured by wild beasts, or human sacrifices were offered by burying the victims under the cippus. Sacrifices of this type are found not only throughout the Semitic field, but in all parts of the world. They belong to the same cate-

gory with the Hebrew show-bread and the Roman *lectisternia*. In later times the food spread on the tables of the god is eaten by his ministers, the priests, to whom he is supposed to make over the enjoyment of the banquet, but this is a refinement on the original usage. In olden times the gods themselves were held to partake of these gifts of food, just as the venerable dead were fed by the meat and drink placed or poured upon the tombs. In the religions of savages both gods and the dead have very material needs, among which the need of nourishment has the first place; and just as we learn from the story of Periander and Melissa that among the Greeks of the seventh century before Christ it was a new idea that the dead could make no use of the gifts buried with them unless they were etherealized by fire; so also the fact that among the Greeks, especially in old times, sacrifices to water gods were simply flung into the river or sea, while sacrifices to underground gods were buried, indicates that it is a secondary idea that the gods were too ethereal to enjoy a sacrifice through any other sense than that of smell. Even the highest antique religions show by unmistakable signs that in their origin sacrifices were literally "food of the gods." It is found in the priestly ritual, in which the sacrifices are called *לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים*, "food of the deity" (see Levit. xxi, 8, 17-21), the Greek "feast of the hecatombs"—Dionysius, the eater of raw (human) flesh. A sacrifice, therefore, is primarily a meal offered to the deity.

We can trace a similarity between the sacrificial ceremonies among the agricultural population of the Mediterranean lands and those of the Jews. The blood, fat, kidneys, etc., were the choice morsels of Jehovah (Levit. iii); the small parts of each joint the Grecian gods enjoyed (Od. xiv, 427). These indicate simple variations of the same sacrificial acts. Wine, too, was added, "which cheereth gods and men" (Judges ix, 15), with music, song, garlands,

sweet odors of incense, etc. The sacrificial meal may be regarded as common to all the so-called nature religions of the civilized races of antiquity—religions which had a predominantly joyous character, and in which the relations of man to the gods were not troubled by any habitual and oppressive sense of human guilt, because the divine standard of man's duty corresponded broadly with the accepted standard of civil conduct, and therefore, though the god might be angry with his people for a time, or even irreconcilably wroth with individuals, the idea was hardly conceivable that he could be permanently alienated from the whole circle of his worshipers—that is, from all who participated in a certain local (tribal or national) cult. But when this type of religion began to break down, the sacrificial ritual underwent corresponding modifications. Thus we find a decline of faith in the old gods, accompanied not only by a growing neglect of the temples and their services, but also by a disposition to alternate the gifts that were still offered, or to take every opportunity to cheat the gods out of part of their dues. It would appear that all religious and civil societies of antiquity have the family for their type, and that the type of sacrifice is such a family meal as is found among the Romans. And this view seems to be favored by the frequent occurrence among ancient peoples of the conception that the deity is the father (progenitor and Lord) of his worshipers, who in turn owe filial obedience to him and brotherly duty to one another. The ordinary functions may be summed up in their sacrificial meals; the stated and normal intercourse between gods and man has no other form. God and worshipers together make up a society of *commensals*, and every other point in their reciprocal relations is included in what this involves. Now, with this we must take the no less certain fact that throughout the sphere of the purely sacrificial religions the circle of common worship is also the

circle of social duty and reciprocal moral obligations. And thus the origin of sacrificial worship must be sought in a stage of society when the circle of commensals and the circle of persons united to each other by sacred social bonds were identical. But all social bonds are certainly developed out of the bond of kindred, and it will be generally admitted that all national religions are developments or combinations of the worship of particular kins. It would seem, therefore, that the world-wide prevalence of sacrificial worship points to a time when kindred groups and the group of the commensals were identical, and when, conversely, people of different kins did not eat and drink together.

§ 17. *Blood Consecration by Moses.*—Why is it, we ask, that Christians and theologians of modern times persist in claiming a supernatural refinement for a barbarous cult and semi-savage civilization of past ages? Has any student or scholar, Christian or secular, ever discovered the slightest trace of a science or an art (except the art of butchery) in the Bible? The entire composition, historical, legal, or poetic, is chiefly devoted to relating the manner of Jehovah's manifestation through the Jewish people. Their state of civilization, as recorded by their own scribes, bears testimony to the advance and progress they had made, their customs and religious cult. Were their methods superior to those of the tribes with whom they came in daily or frequent contact? Are they entitled to higher consideration or more sympathy than the neighboring nations or kinsfolk with whom they were almost constantly in conflict when not fighting among themselves? Socially, morally, or politically they were no better than the prevailing tendencies of the age. Gods and men must be judged by their acts. The test of knowledge or reason, as far as we are able to ascertain, must be applied indiscriminately to gods

and men alike, ancient or modern. Why should we apply one test for Jupiter, another for Baal, and another for Jehovah? Consider for a moment, with sober judgment and without prejudice; when Jehovah commands Moses to consecrate his brother to the priesthood, under what standard of civilization would you classify either God or man, in either commanding or performing the act (Ex. xxix, 20, 21): "Then shalt thou kill the ram, and take of his blood, and put it upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot, and sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons," etc. (Levit. viii, 23): "And he slew it; and Moses took of the blood of it, and put it upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand," etc. No man or woman, however pious, would be foolish enough to regard this performance as an act of refinement and culture. Similar customs were practiced by other barbarous nations some thousand or more years before Christ. That does not speak very highly for the wisdom of God, the sagacity of Moses, or the grade of civilization of either. In contrast with this antique mode of ornamentation our Indian in his paint must be considered as highly civilized. Comparing the Indian and Mosaic modes of decoration (the moral, social, and ethical effect), the semi-savage Indian is certainly preferable.

§ 18. *Transubstantiation* consists in the transmutation of the *bread* and *wine* in the communion into the body and blood and, by connection and concomitance, into the soul and divinity of our Lord. "The host, therefore, under the form of bread, con-

tains the mediator's total and identical body, soul, and deity. Nothing of the substance of bread and wine remains after consecration." This mode of sacred feeding has caused no end of controversy, persecution, and cursing. Paschasius, who was a Benedictine monk, afterward abbot of Corbeil, in France, published, A.D. 831, a treatise "Concerning the Body and Blood of Christ," which he presented fifteen years afterwards, carefully revised and augmented, to Charles the Bold, king of France. The doctrine advanced by him may be expressed by the two following propositions: "First, that after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper nothing remained of the symbols but the out-figure, under which the body and blood of Christ were locally present. Secondly, that the body and blood of Christ thus present in the eucharist was the same body that was born of the virgin, that suffered on the cross, and was raised from the dead."

Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, the most famous opposer of this newly invented dogma, wrote in reply to Paschasius in 847, which is so decisive a proof that in that age this absurd dogma was regarded as a novelty, that it is worthy of especial notice. "Some persons," says he, "of late, not entertaining a sound opinion respecting the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, *have actually ventured to declare that this is the identical body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; the identical body, to-wit, which was born of the Virgin Mary, in which Christ suffered on the cross, and in which he arose from the dead. This error we have opposed with all our might.*" The question of stercorianism (from *stercor*—dung) arose immediately out of these disputes. Paschasius maintained "that bread and wine in the sacrament are not under the same laws with our other food, as they pass into our flesh and substance without any evacuation." Bertram affirmed that "the bread and wine are under the same laws with all other food."

Berenger (1045), archdeacon of Angers, publicly maintaining the doctrine of Johannes Scotus, warmly opposed the monstrous opinions of Paschasius Radbert, which were adapted to captivate a superstitious multitude by exciting their astonishment. The Roman pontiff, Leo IX, in the year 1050 attacked Berenger with peculiar vehemence and fury, and in two councils—the one assembled at Rome, and the other at Vercelli—had this doctrine solemnly condemned, and the book of Scotus, from which it was drawn, committed to the flames. In the year 1054 two different councils assembled at Tours to examine the views held by Berenger. Hildebrand, who was afterwards pontiff under the title of Gregory VII, appeared in the character of legate, and opposed the new doctrine of Berenger with the utmost vehemence. Berenger, overwhelmed with threats, abandoned his opinions, but when danger was past he taught them anew, though with greater circumspection. Berenger's defection reached the ears of Pope Nicholas II, whereat the exasperated pontiff summoned him to Rome (A. D. 1059), and, in the council held there the following year, so terrified him that he declared his readiness to embrace and adhere to the doctrines which that memorable assembly should think proper to impose on his faith.

In the year 1078, under the popedom of Gregory VII, in a council held at Rome, Berenger was again called on to draw up a new confession of faith and to renounce that which had been composed by Humbert, though it had been solemnly approved and confirmed by Nicholas II and a Roman council. In consequence of the threats and compulsion of his enemies, Berenger confirmed by an oath "that the bread laid upon the altar became after consecration the true body of Christ which was born of the virgin, suffered on the cross and now sits on the right hand of the father; and that the wine placed on the altar became after consecration the true blood which

flowed from the side of Christ." Berenger no sooner got out of the hands of his enemies than he maintained his true sentiments, retreating to the isle of St. Cosne, near Tours, and died in 1088, repenting his dissimulation.

The most astonishing frauds were practiced upon the ignorant masses. Pope Innocent III (A. D. 1100) issued the decree on transubstantiation, as follows : "The body and blood of Christ are contained really in the sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine : the bread being *transubstantiated into the body* of Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood by the power of God" (Council Lateran ix, cap. 1). The popular belief in the wafer-god was established by the ecclesiastical authority. Wafer-wonders and miracles soon filled every community.

1. The wafer turned into a little boy in the beehive.

2. The holy bees who built a popish chapel.

3. The holy asses who knelt before a wafer idol.

4. The Jew's dog that worshiped the host, and bit his master's nose off for destroying it.

5. St. Anthony of Padua compelling a horse to kneel before the wafer-god.

6. The unbelieving Jew fetches blood from the wafer, which turns into the body of Christ dying on the cross, and afterward turns again into a wafer, etc.

This transmutation, as this miracle pretends, this real, living body and soul, was chewed between the teeth, and swallowed. Is it not plain, therefore, that those who partook of the horrible banquet would be guilty of eating human flesh ? The mastication of the sacramental elements, if transubstantiation be true, makes the communicant the rankest cannibal. The believer in the corporal presence, according to his own system, devours human flesh and blood, and, to show the refinement of his taste, indulges in all the luxury of anthropophagy. The

following questions and answers occur in a work entitled "On the Blessed Eucharist" :

" Question : What is the blessed Eucharist ? Answer : The body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine.

" Q. What do you mean by the appearance of bread and wine ? A. The taste, color, and form of bread and wine, which still remain after the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ,

" Q. Are both the body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and under the appearance of wine ? A. Yes ; Christ is whole and entire, *true God* and *true man*, under the appearance of each," etc.

Hoc est corpus, which has been converted into the cant phrase, *hocus pocus*, used by pretended conjurers, truly represents this ecclesiastical fraud. No wonder that the old Arabian philosopher, Averroes, when brought into contact with this heathenish superstition, exclaimed with surprise and disgust, " I have traveled over the world, and seen many people, but none so selfish and ridiculous as Christians, who devour the god they worship ! "

PART II.

§ 1. *God and Sin in the Sexual Appetites.*—The sexual appetites present quite another phase. These give rise to innumerable sins and crimes among all civilized nations. In what light offenses of this kind are viewed depends upon custom (restraints, limits, or existing laws). That these sins or crimes should exist in civilized communities is not at all surprising. The animal instincts are always dominant, and in the vast majority of mankind predominant. Prevailing laws hold them partially in check, but the intellectual force is not yet strong enough, nor sufficiently developed, to subdue them; nor is the discipline or the education of a kind to teach the young how to control them. We have daily demonstrations of the fact that opportunity breeds crime; besides, we are drilled by the predominating greed and selfishness to seize every opportunity, either to gain wealth or to satisfy the passions—in a legitimate manner if we can, or illegitimate if need demands. The unrestrained passion will seek or create opportunities for indulgence, and sins of the sexual appetites will be committed in spite of known laws. The antiquated church discipline so long taught and enforced has done very little, for good results cannot be expected from deluding ourselves and deceiving humanity, or by beguiling men with empty promises. Every intelligent man and woman ought to understand that sin is a product of civiliza-

tion. The lower the civilization, the fewer sins; and as the laws multiply, crimes and sins become more numerous. Man did not start backward, but forward, for both history and science demonstrate the fact that his beginning was as an animal. The chief and distinguishing feature between man and animals is the size of the brain and the superiority of its power, and the higher intelligence and culture consequently possible. Beginning, therefore, at the opening of man's career, we may state with a considerable degree of certainty that

I.—There was a time when no such thing as sin existed on earth.

II.—Man, in his earliest stages, did not sin, could not sin, and knew nothing of sin.

III.—Sins were not evolved until some restrictions of the appetite had been established and the rights of property recognized.

IV.—Man in his primitive state had no moral sense, moral obligation, nor moral standing as we now know and recognize them.

V.—Those human attributes which we at the present day designate as virtues were unknown to primitive man. These were evolved and their growth was stimulated by and in the struggle for existence and self-preservation. They have passed through a refining process of ages of such experience as must have been entirely foreign to our ancestors.

VI.—Sins arising from the appetites must have been entirely unknown to man in a primitive state. He followed his natural instincts very much after the manner of animals.

VII.—Man in a savage and purely natural state knew nothing of good or evil. These arose when he began to discriminate, when civilization had made considerable progress.

VIII.—Restrictions and restraints of the appetites were not practiced; gratification and complete sa-

tiety of the desires and passions followed their natural indulgence.

IX.—Laws (rules or regulations) governing the appetites were unknown to primitive man, these being the invention of civilization, the product of a higher mental culture and condition.

X.—The sexual relations (indulgence of the sexual appetite) were in no way either systematized or regulated in the pristine state of man; neither laws nor rules were known, except those natural inclinations and habits found among the lower brutes, savages, and barbarians.

From the very fact, therefore, that no laws, rules, or acquired habits existed to restrain or regulate the sexual appetites, it is evident that primitive man, like animals, could not and did not sin, do wrong, or commit crime by indulging them. Where there are no recognized rules, established principles, social customs, or methodic habits in family or community relations individuals are prompted to action by brutish desire, lust, or passion.

Animals neither recognize nor acknowledge nor feel the ties of family, relation, or kindred—mother and child excepted. The young animal knows its mother, and the mother knows its young, which, for a limited period only, she nourishes, fondles, and cares for; but when the young is old enough to take care of itself the mother drives it from her. The young animal knows nothing of its father, and recognizes its mother only for a time. The sexual relations are promiscuous. Father, mother, sister, brother are to them unknown, and all—father and daughter, son and mother, sister and brother—propagate indiscriminately. The distinction of sex is alone recognized. A natural selection, an instinctive preference, does indeed exist, though this preference may fall to the nearest of kin. Consanguinity, however, in no way interferes with their sexual appetites

or with the exercise of their sexual function with their nearest relations.

Family circles (family unions) originated, in all probability, with the recognition of property rights, mutual protection, and the assertion of authority. Prehistoric man followed his instincts. He was guided almost entirely by his appetites, and not by his intellect, for he had none. What reason have we for believing or for making the statement?

§ 2. *Historical Evidence.*—(1) In many barbarous communities the family, in our sense of the word, does not exist. (2) The traditions of civilized races report a similar state of things in their early experience. (3) The domestic institutions of savages, and traces of the same manners among civilized races, point to an age when the family was not constituted in the modern way. (4) The larger tribal associations of savages were clearly not developed out of the monogamous or patriarchal family. (5) The larger tribal associations of Greece, Rome, and India bear marks of having been evolved out of the tribal association of savages. If these points can be proved, the family is not the earliest, but one of the latest conquests of civilization.

At whatever epoch civilized travelers have visited people of less cultivation, they have noted, not the family, but promiscuity and polyandry. They have found men and women living together in what seemed unregulated community; or they have found that the woman had several husbands, and often that these husbands were brothers; they have alleged that the woman, not the man, was really at the head of the household, that kinship was traced through the female line, on account of the certainty of that sort of genealogy, and consequently that a man's children belonged not to his own family, but to that of his wife, in whose affection he had only a limited or transitory share. It may be assumed with some

confidence that these customs, observed in lands and ages widely apart, cannot have grown out of the monogamous or patriarchal family as we know it. The limitless area in which such practice has been usual may be gathered from a few examples.

Herodotus tells us of the Agathyrsi, a Scythian people: "They have their women in common, that they may all be brothers of one another." The Nasamones have similar customs.

Aristotle likewise relates that in Lybia they have women in common, and distribute the children by their likeness to the men.

Diodorus Siculus reports the same manners among the Troglodytes, the Scythophagi on the coast of the Red sea, etc. Among modern savages we find the custom of lending wives, as an act of friendliness and hospitality, very common.

Wilson says that the marriage custom of Thibet assigns to a woman several brothers as joint husbands. This amazing practice is the rule of life "among thirty millions of respectable people." Polyandry is traced to points half around the globe.

Cæsar describes something like it among the inhabitants of Great Britain: "Ten or twelve men have wives in common, and chiefly brothers share with brothers, and fathers with children."

Hamilton states that among the Nairs of Malabar a woman has several husbands, but these are not brothers.

Buchanan says that the Nair woman lives with her mother or brother, or in other cases has a house of her own, where she receives her husband, "No Nair knows his father, and every man looks upon his sister's children as his heirs." Tradition tells us that Indo-Europeans and other polite peoples lived once in a stage of promiscuity, and they too allotted many husbands to one wife. Beginning with Greece, we find in Suidas the legend that the women abandoned themselves to unchecked vice, and that the

male parentage of children could not be ascertained. According to the story of Varro, it was Cecrops, the serpent-king, who first instituted marriage, just as the Australian natives credit the lizard with the discovery. The Hindoos give it to Svetaketu, before whose date "women were unconfined and roamed at their pleasure. . . . This ancient custom is even now the rule for creatures born as brutes, . . . and it is still practiced among the northern Kurus." The Egyptians attributed the origin of marriage to the rule of Menes; the Chinese, to Fohi. Polyandry seems to have existed among the Aryan-Indians. Descent through the female has been traced to them, and legendary evidence goes to show that polyandry was almost a universal practice. Again, where the custom is met with, though marriage has become fixed, and where woman are mistresses of the household and heads of the family, it is not easy to give any other explanation of the facts than this: That they are survivals from a time when the union of sexes was lax and temporary. Where, then, do we meet with examples of kindred traced through the female line? In Australia, Marianne Islands, Fijii, Tongo, Caroline Islands, among the Kams of the Golden Chersonese, etc. To select some more modern instances, the Singhalese, the Nairs of Malabar, the Kachos (an Indian tribe), and Zapotague Cossacks; the red man of North America as a rule; the Indians of British Guiana, and many African tribes. Herodotus says of the Lycians: "This custom they have to themselves, and herein agree with no other men, in that they name themselves by the mother's side and not by the father's. And if one ask another who he is, he will recount his maternal descent and reckon up his mother's maternal ancestors." The same author declares that in Egypt the daughters were compelled by law to maintain their parents, while the sons were free to do as they pleased. M. Revillant reports that

women were mistresses of the household and owners of the property at one time in Egypt.

§ 3. *Marital Reform*.—The foregoing brief statement suffices to call attention to the fact that the marital relations, as they exist in modern times, are, comparatively speaking, the most recent. That the relation of the sexes have undergone some very remarkable changes from the earliest state to civilization there can be no doubt. The transformation from the primitive order of sexual intercourse was a slow process of evolution from a lower to a higher plane of sexual relations and sexual propriety; beginning, like animals, with promiscuity, thence to polyandry, consanguinity, female authority, female descent, female property ownership, etc., and gradually swinging around to an opposite direction, bringing about male ascendancy, pairing couples or selection of individuals, patriarchal family, male descent, polygamy, monogamy concubinage, mistresses. Prostitution, adultery, etc., were the incidental results of family life and male ascendancy. Mr. Morgan, in his system of classification, 1871 (*System of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Race*), followed Nicholas Damasconus, one of the inquirers into early society, who lived in the first century of our era, and first brought the evolution of the family to notice. Mr. Morgan describes five different and successive forms of the family:

“I. *The Consanguine Family*.—It was founded upon intermarriage of brothers and sisters, own and collateral, in a group.

“II. *The Panaluan Family*.—It was founded upon the intermarriage of several sisters, own and collateral, with one another's husband in a group, the joint husbands not being necessarily kinsman of one another; also upon the intermarriage of several brothers, own and collateral, with one another's wives in a group, these wives not be-

ing necessarily kin of one another, although often the case in both instances [sic]. In each case the group of men were conjointly married to the group of women.

"III. *The Syndyasmian or Pairing Family*.—It was founded upon marriage between single pairs, but without an exclusive cohabitation. The marriage continued during the pleasure of the parties.

"IV. *The Patriarchal Family*.—It was founded upon marriage of one man with several wives, and was generally accompanied with the exclusiveness of the wives.

"V. *The Monogamic Family*.—It was founded upon marriage between single pairs, with an exclusive cohabitation.

"Three of these forms, namely, the first, second, and fifth, were radical, because they were sufficiently general and influential to create three distinct systems of consanguinity, all of which still exist in living forms. Conversely, these systems are sufficient of themselves to prove the antecedent existence of the forms of the family and of marriage with which they severally stand connected."

Though the study of the development of the social family relation, the union between the sexes, is very interesting, we can allude to only a few of the facts. Treatises upon this subject must be consulted in order to obtain a full and complete account. That primitive man, as geology reveals him, was gregarious, like animals, living in flocks or herds, is not difficult to imagine or understand. The savage has no moral data, no ethical sense to cause disgust at relations which seem revolting to us. It is improbable that they discovered the supposed physical evil of breeding in-and-in. That discovery could have been made only after a long experience, and in the consanguine family that experience was impossible. We have no sort of evidence as to man's truly primitive manner, for all existing savages have had many ages of experience and, as it were, of education. It can hardly be

supposed, however, that the earliest men had any instinctive repugnance to marriage with near kin. Their association would be based on the sentiment of kindred not yet brought into explicit consciousness, and on community of residence. They would be named by the name of their group. The blood relationship of the mother to the child would be the first they perceived. As time went on they could reason out other relationships through woman, but male kinship would remain, though not unknown as a fact, unrecognized in custom, because, if harmony was to exist within the group, it could be secured "through indifference and promiscuity," which made certainty of male parentage impossible. Now let it be supposed, as a vast body of evidence leads us to suppose, that female children were slaughtered as *bouches inutiles*, the result would be a scarcity of women within the group. To secure wives men would be obliged to steal them from other groups which were, *ex hypothesi*, hostile. This is almost the state of things, according to Montaigne, "where the servile condition of woman is looked upon with such contempt that they kill all the native females and buy wives from their neighbors." Now, in each group—by the system of capture—there are members of alien groups, namely, the women and the children, who, as we have seen, are recognized as connections of the mothers, not the fathers. Let these practices be formed into customary law; refuse a man permission to marry a woman of his stock-name (marked by the totem), and you have exogamy, or what Mr. Morgan called "the gentile organization." Within the groups are several families of the earliest type, the female and her offspring. Next conceive of the sets of mother's sons as feeling a stronger bond of union between themselves and the other members of the group, and as living with their mother. They cannot marry their sisters (who are of the same name and totem as themselves),

but they regard their sisters' children as their heirs. To their own putative children they can only make presents *inter vivos*, and the sisters are wedded each to a set of men in the manner of the Nairs. But as property was amassed, the brothers would prefer to keep their property in the hands of their putative children, and "there would be a disposition in favor of a system of marriage which would allow of the property passing to the brother's own children. This form of marriage would be the one prevailing in Thibet. The elder brother, the first to marry, would have some of the attributes of the pater familias. Thus the idea of fatherhood attained something like maturity. Chiefs, however, would secure one or more wives to themselves, and their example imitated would produce monandry. The old state of things would leave its trace in the levirate, the duty of 'raising up seed to a brother.'"

Captain Galton shows, in his book on "Hereditary Germs," how evil is the influence of consanguineous marriages. The history of the Ptolemies is especially striking. Alexander the Great had for a half-brother Ptolemy I, king of Egypt. This king had twelve descendants, who became also kings of Egypt, and all were called Ptolemy. They were matched in-and-in like prize cattle, but these near marriages were unprolific. The inheritance mostly passed through other wives. Ptolemy II married his niece, and afterwards his sister; Ptolemy IV married his sister; Ptolemies VI and VII were brothers, and both consecutively married the same sister. Ptolemy VII also subsequently married his niece; Ptolemy VIII married two of his own sisters consecutively; Ptolemies XII and XIII were brothers, and both consecutively married their sister—the famous Cleopatra.

§ 4. *The Bible bears testimony* that promiscuous sexual relation was the practice, the common cus-

tom, in the land which the Hebrews conquered. Leviticus xviii, 6, 23-27, specifically prohibits by ordinances the uncovering of the nakedness of any that is near of kin (that is, consanguineous intercourse is forbidden); of father and mother, of the father's wife, the sister, daughter of the father, daughter of the mother, whether she be born at home or abroad; of son's daughter, daughter's daughter; of the father's wife's daughter begotten by thy father; the father's sister, mother's sister, father's brother, daughter-in-law, brother's wife; of a woman and her daughter, her son's daughter or her daughter's daughter, or to take a wife to her sister; "for all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled." Yet polygamy and concubinage were permitted; stealing of wives was encouraged (Judges xxi, 20, 21: "Therefore they commanded the children of Benjamin, saying, Go and lie in wait in the vineyards; to catch the daughters of Shiloh," etc.). The ordinances as laid down in Leviticus do not prohibit intermarriage with strangers; they are especially devoted to inveighing against promiscuous and consanguineous unions. The reformation of Ezra and Nehemiah on their return from captivity first restricted marriages within the group, circle, or nation. Says Ezra x, 3, 11: "We have trespassed against *our* God and have taken strange wives;" "Let us make a covenant with *our* God to put away all the wives and such as are born of them;" "And separate yourselves from the people of the land and from the strange wives." See also the covenant of Nehemiah (x, 30): "And that we would not give our daughters unto the people of the land, nor take their daughters for our sons."

In this reformation polygamy is nowhere mentioned by either Ezra or Nehemiah as being prohibited; we may therefore assume that it was permissible. The condemnation of sins arising from the sexual appetites was mainly directed against con-

sanguineous intercourse, fornication, and adultery; also approaching a beast. The punishment prescribed for these offenses, as reported in Leviticus xx, was very severe.

The union of the sexes, or marriage, was not the invention of God, or of legislators, but evolved from the experience and the necessities of society, which could not advance far without rules for the appropriation of men and women to one another, securing them in the enjoyment of one another's companionship, and defining their obligations to their progeny. But while experience and necessity everywhere led to the institution of marriage, the forms of the institution were exceedingly various. At what time the necessities presented themselves we have no means of ascertaining, but whenever the occasion arose, in some way fixing or limiting the union or cohabitation between the sexes, that was the first step toward regulating the sexual appetites. We must not, however, omit to state that the union of the sexes confers certain rights, imposes certain obligations, and becomes one of the leading bases of law; and it is probable that, around it, laws began to grow. In some places the old names for law and marriage are interchangeable, and everywhere the institution of marriage equally with that of laws has been ascribed to the first rule. Thus we find that while the Levitical ordinances place restrictions on the sexual appetites, prohibiting consanguine unions, fornication, etc., they encourage polygamy and concubinage. Although Ezra's reformation restricts marriages to the circle or group—within the ranks of their own people, and marriages with strangers are forbidden—no further limit on the sexual appetite is imposed; nor any check placed on other irregularities of this appetite.

§ 5. *Christianity had its Birth in the Sexual Appetites.*—When we turn our attention to the evolution

of Christianity, what do we find? It is hardly necessary at this time to discuss the changes of opinion, the modification of religious notions, the new ideas developed by contact, exchange, or importation, during the several centuries which intervened between Ezra's reformation and the Christian era, nor what led to the development of Christianity. But we may broadly announce that Christianity, like all other systems, had its birth in the appetites—the sexual appetites, of course. By sensitive people such an assertion might be considered very shocking, but since it is true we have neither excuses to make nor apologies to offer.

Matthew i, 18: "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." 19. "Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily." In verse 20 an angel gives Joseph a reason why and how she became so. The 21st verse explains the purpose in the following: "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins."

Mark has nothing to say concerning the manner in which Christ was begotten.

Luke is made to enter into detail, and tries to give a little circumstantial evidence, coupled with another sexual miracle. Elizabeth was the wife of Zacharias. "And they had no child, because Elizabeth was barren; and they both were now well stricken in years" (Luke i, 7). "And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years" (Id. 18). Of course we have no manner of learning the exact age of either Zacharias or his wife; Elizabeth was the mother of John, whose birth was evidently legitimate, though his father and mother were strick-

en in years ; whether it was miraculous or not is of no real consequence. The story of Luke concerning Mary is a little fuller, more romantic. Verse 27 tells us that a virgin was espoused to a man whose name was Joseph ; verse 31, the angel said unto her, "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus."

35. "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee ; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the son of God." 36. "And, behold, thy cousin Elizabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age ; and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren." 37. "For with God nothing shall be impossible."

However exalted the character of Jesus Christ is made to appear ; however divine his mission may be considered ; whatever beauty and grandeur his admirers may find in him ; whether he is considered as the most beautiful incarnation of God in the most beautiful of human forms, as some express it ; whether he was a man charged with a special, express, and unique commission from God to lead mankind to truth and virtue ; or whether he was, as Paul says, the only begotten son of God manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, and so forth, the naked truth remains the same.

Matthew and Luke agree that Mary was the wife of Joseph. Matthew states that Mary was found with child by the Holy Ghost before they came together. Luke reports that an angel informed Mary what and how she should conceive, and what the Holy Ghost was going to do (27, 31, 35), the angel of God knowing she was a married woman. According to Matthew, Mary was in an interesting condition at the time she married Joseph—in other words, Mary had been seduced, prior to her marriage, by the Holy Ghost. Not willing to make her a public

example (v. 19) Joseph was minded to "put her away privily." Evidently a prudent, cautious man, yet ashamed of her. This standard of morality would certainly not in modern times be considered of a very high order.

Luke is made to describe this transaction otherwise, the angel came in unto her (v. 28) "and said," etc. The date of this conversation (v. 26) is stated to have been the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy, and after the marriage of Mary to Joseph. This angel informs her (v. 35) that the Holy Ghost shall come upon her, and that holy thing which shall be born of her shall be called the son of God. According to Luke, Mary is made to commit adultery. Do you thoroughly understand the words and meaning of the text as it is written? or must it require volumes of commentaries to explain it? However sublime the story of the miraculous conception might have been to primitive Christians, or whatever charm it may have to the mind of modern Christians, we cannot be so dull, so blind, so ignorant, as not to grasp the facts, interpret the meaning, and understand the words so plainly written in the text. Truth is religion, as we take it, because truth is good. Untruth, falsehood, wherever found, is not good—it is unwholesome. If the illicit sexual intercourse of God, the Holy Ghost, angels or man can find any excuse or extenuating circumstance in the fact that the act is embodied in the fundamental principle of Christianity, then it would be well to ask, Where are the precepts, where is the moral purity, and what the examples or lessons it teaches?

§ 6. *All Things Possible with God.*—We have no alternative but to frankly, freely, openly, without prejudice, belief, miracle, or mystery, judge of the transactions as we find them described. "For with God nothing shall be impossible," says Luke. People might have thought so in Luke's time, or even

within a century or so of our own time ; but a great revolution has taken place in the minds of men ; the intellectual faculties have undergone immense changes. We should bear in mind the nineteen hundred years of accumulated experience, which means nineteen centuries of education, in addition to a century or so of actual culture of the positive sciences, which has been disseminated broadcast among the masses. The ordinary reading man and woman have their faculties more or less developed ; they have learned to observe, think, reflect, reason, discern, and discriminate, which neither priest, saint, nor God was capable of doing nineteen hundred years ago. If any person should venture to proclaim at this time that all things were possible with God, he would be ridiculed, and accounted as a fool or fraud. We know that God has no more power to influence the processes of nature than you or ourselves have.

Laws of nature, or natural laws, are terms used to express uniformity of action of the elementary substances or objects in nature which have come under our observation. All bodies, large or small, animate or inanimate, are subject to a uniformity of action. Natural phenomena, or function of bodies, naturally obey similar laws. This uniformity of action, called law, is unchangeable, unalterable ; these laws are fixed and permanent. Neither God, nor pope, nor saint can change, modify, or alter them. They are inherent in all bodies, matter, or beings, of whatever the form or character, phase or phenomenon. Whenever intelligent man observes or recognizes any uniformity of action, in nature or in the universe, he applies to it a law. These laws are human discoveries, or human interpretations. Primitive man, the lower types, of savages and animals, knew nothing of law, natural or otherwise. He knew nothing of time or what caused night and day ; he had no faculties for cognizing them. The age has

passed when man can be deceived by ancient fables or fiction; the fixed principles of life are generally known, and we are aware of our ignorance concerning what we do not know. The powers and work of nature are not necessarily supernatural because we cannot account for their origin.

The explanation of the existence of the unknowable is that our intellectual faculties are not sufficiently developed to cognize it. The masses have been educated under coercion by priest and preacher, and drilled in the belief that God made all things, including the laws of nature, which is an assumption not warranted by our enlightened experience, or what we already know. Extravagant, high-sounding scriptural phrases cannot deceive us, nor can the miraculous or supernatural mysteries mitigate the errors committed through the ignorance of the ancients. The reproduction of living beings can be accomplished only by actual contact of male and female elements. This uniformity of action is universally recognized in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and man is no exception to the rule (or law). The physiological law regulating the reproductive process, neither God, Christ, nor Holy Ghost can stop or change. The unscientific farmer's wife understands it. Experience has taught her the kind of eggs to select from which to hatch chickens. When she looks through the egg, she recognizes which egg has been fertilized by the male fowl and which has not, and she is seldom mistaken. Now, it is no more possible for God or Holy Ghost to cause Mary to conceive and give birth to a child than it is for the farmer's wife to hatch a chicken from an egg that does not contain the male element. No more need be said on that point.

Sacrifices of a minor character appear still to have been the custom. Luke (ii, 21, 24) tells us that after the birth and circumcision of Christ, and the mother's purification, they brought him to Jerusalem "to

offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons." This shows that even in Christ's time they had not entirely ceased the practice of feeding God (Jehovah).

Christianity was the natural heir of Judaism—an outgrowth, a development, and a modification of the Hebraic system, combined with the religious and ethical cult of other neighboring nations. During a period of five hundred years previous to the dawn of the Christian era, new, more refined and humanizing ideas had evolved; a higher civilization had been inculcated; barbarism and savagery had been forced to yield to the pressure of advancing thought. Adherents of the new faith could not entirely free their minds from the old national cult that was so firmly seated in all their mental operations, their customs, habits, and discipline. It is no wonder, therefore, that when the men of advanced thought assumed the task of formulating a new religious constitution—a new mode of worship—they collected the most essential, or what we might term the cardinal points of several systems and amalgamated, combining or uniting the principal ideas, the most advanced notions or teachings of the age, the product of a higher civilization, as the accepted basis for the reformation.

§ 7. What were the *essential elements* of their reformation?

(1) Jehovah, the god of the Old Testament. This monotheistic idea or principle was at once the important and necessary element, representing, as it did, the most advanced theistic religious thought. That formed the center of Christianity.

(2) The Grecian idea of polytheism could not be entirely dispensed with. The Pagan mind was not ripe to accept a purely abstract idea of a God, and some representative form of polytheism was there-

fore deemed advisable, in order to induce the adherents of the old system to accept the new religion.

(3) The mystery of birth and being was the deepest mystery of nature; it lay at the root of all thoughtful paganism and appeared in various forms, some of a more innocent, others of a more debasing type. To ancient pagan thinkers, as well as modern men of science, the key to the hidden secrets of the origin and the preservation of the universe lay in the mystery of sex. I may state here that in each and every form of polytheism we find the slimy track of the deification of the sex. There is not a single one of the ancient religions that has not consecrated by some ceremonial rite even the grossest forms of sensual indulgences, while many of them actually elevated prostitution into a solemn service of religion.

(4) This Christian reformation, this new religion, had to be built on the old and decaying religious systems. It was entirely incompatible with their mental state to have a new religion without having a new god. The monotheistic idea of Jehovahism had been spread through many regions by the Jewish exiles, and could therefore not be dispensed with; the period for the evolution of a new god had disappeared; the people had grown too intelligent. Men had grown skeptical; they had traveled; reading and writing were being cultivated; the oral traditions were doubted; invading armies brought new ideas; arts had advanced somewhat, nature was being investigated, positive science began.

(5) Miracles were in full force, and were practiced everywhere and by everybody. These miracles, with few exceptions, were entirely of a medical character, and consisted, in the main, of casting out devils, making deaf men hear, blind men see, laying on hands, raising the dead, curing epilepsy and all kinds of nervous diseases; curing impotency and other diseases. Among other wonders performed

was making pregnant barren women, old women and virgins. This peculiar craft was a heritage from the Old Testament.

(6) The superstition, credulity, and ignorance of that period, as well as the expectation of some great wonder-working person to lead the Jews back to their promised land, and to relieve them of their misery, made abundant material for any hope of relief—any kind of promise—in place of the tyranny, slavery, and degradation to which the lower classes were subjected. In mental culture, the people generally, high and low, rich and poor, at the dawn of the Christian era, were nineteen hundred years lower than we are to-day. It is well to understand the significance of that statement. If you perceive any difference in the intellectual qualities of a Bismarck and an Australian, you may, by a little effort, realize the vast gulf between the intellectual qualities of the ancients and the men of to-day, just as there was an immense difference mentally between the man of the Christian era and prehistoric man two or more thousand years before Christ.

The foregoing, I hope, will suffice to throw some light on this mysterious subject that still acts as a spell on the minds of the unthinking. When we for one moment reflect on the foolish, deluded, credulous people of to-day, who readily swallow the miracle bait of modern churches, it is no wonder that the people of nineteen centuries back readily believed in the miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost, and that Christ was the only begotten son of God. As we have already intimated, no new religion at that period could have been founded without a birth of a god or at least a son of God—the Jehovistic-Grecian-pagan combination. Thus, in the first place, Christianity had its birth in the appetites, and in the second place was built upon the ruins of the decaying systems of monotheistic and polytheistic religions.

Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews (x, 8, 10, 12) says, "In place of burnt offerings and sin offerings . . . by which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all . . . But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Paul further declares (Heb. ix, 19-22) that the sacrifices of Moses, the blood of calves, goats, etc., scarlet wool, hyssop, sprinkling, books, people, altar, etc., are thereby abolished.

There can be no doubt that the idea of sacrifice occupied an important place in early Christianity. It had been a fundamental element of both Jewish and gentile religions, and Christianity tended rather to absorb and modify such elements than to abolish them. To a great extent the idea had been modified already. Among the Jews the preaching of the prophets had been a constant protest against the grosser forms of sacrifice; and there are indications that when Christianity arose, bloody sacrifices were already beginning to fall into disuse; and a saying which was attributed by the Ebonites to Christ repeats this protest in a strong form: "I have come to abolish the sacrifices, and if you do not cease from sacrificing, the wrath of God will not cease from you" (Epiph. xxv, 16). Among the Greeks the philosophers had come to use both argument and ridicule against the idea that the offering of material things could be needed by or acceptable to the maker of them all.

§ 8. *Sin in Birth.*—There seems to be an impression, among even intelligent classes, that the forms of social life, or religious customs, as we know them to-day, were always the same. Nothing of the kind. They were slow evolutions and were successively evolved as experience accumulated and intelligence grew. When the man of antiquity had reached that point of civilization when promiscuous intercourse

partially ceased, when fetiches and totems had been established, and were in turn superseded by nature worship and idols, he also entered into the realm of appetite-regulation. With the patriarchal family life, polytheism and animal sacrifices, the progress in a civilizing direction was still greater. But when we reach the period of nineteen centuries ago—when every antique idea had to yield to the new thought—blood sacrifices, polytheism, idolatry, polygamy, and concubinage gave way, and monogamic marriages were inaugurated, a qualified monotheism established, and a higher moral and social cult introduced. We cannot form a conception of the vast ages that must have passed since the earliest period when crude, animal man, with full freedom exercised all the natural license of his appetites, without sin, without limit, without restraint, without rule or regulation except as nature prompted, without a fetich, a totem, an idol, a sacrifice, or a god. That this condition once prevailed we have ample testimony; besides, we ourselves, with all our experience, culture, and education, bear the marks of our former primitive state. The notion that man is born in sin is too silly for consideration. There is but one process of propagating the race, and it is no less natural to us than to plants and animals. Only certain sexual acts committed without the legally recognized limits in civilized communities become a sin.

Let us now inquire: Did Christ die for the sins of man for all time? The doctrine of vicarious atonement signifies that Jesus Christ was the sacrifice, not only for the sins of the men living in his time, and those who have been born and have died since his time, but for the multitudes to be born for millions of ages to come. It means, moreover, that Jesus Christ was offered as a sacrifice for sins not yet invented, for new sins or crimes that might develop during the progress of civilization; for breaches of

laws not yet enacted, for crimes yet unknown, for infractions of moral and social rules not in existence, for restraints and limits of the appetites not recognized.

It also means that Christ was sacrificed for all those sins that are hidden within the consciousness of man, and for those kinds of sin that are the outgrowth or product of a highly-cultured, sensitive mind—a mind so elevated and adjusted by education and training, so evenly balanced in judgment and wisdom, scrupulously honorable and truthful, so susceptible to the slightest deviation that the least trespass touches its delicate consciousness and is held by them as a sin; a sin which is not directly an outgrowth of the appetites, but rather of a highly sensitive nervous condition.

§ 9. *Sins not Forgiven.*—There are sins which can be neither forgiven nor punished by law. Take alcoholism, for instance, the priests (themselves lovers of the cheering beverage) may forgive drunkenness, but the law punishes the drunkard when found in a state of intoxication. Prayers may be said for him, he may himself indulge in that pious exercise, but none of these things will alleviate his condition nor help him any after the internal organs have become diseased. Nature holds the individual responsible for his own acts, and he must suffer the penalty of his ignorance or his negligence. So, too, the evils arising from the sexual appetites may be forgiven by the priest; they cannot be punished by law, nor cured by prayer; nor can they be atoned for, except by suffering; belief, creed, nor faith will relieve the victim; he must pay the penalty of his indulgence—which is unavoidable, perhaps, from the sensation he felt, the pleasure he enjoyed—the contraction of venereal and kindred diseases. Neither the moral, social nor ecclesiastical world troubles itself much about the matter, so long as the devout brother or

sister wears the garb of piety, and supports the church. Is not the very thought irrational and absurd, that Christ, the son of God, died for any person who has contracted syphilis, or who is suffering from any other disease, either inherited or acquired? What influence has priest, preacher, or prayer in relieving a person afflicted with a serious bodily injury or organic disease? Sexual sins of some kind have been prevalent among barbarous and civilized people, among the ancient and modern, heathen and Christian; *i. e.*, sexual irregularities, indulgences injurious to the mind and body, and abnormal satisfaction of the desires. Among these are specifically (1) onanism, masturbation, or self-pollution, the using of various devices by either sex as a means to induce the sexual orgasm outside of the normal sexual intercourse. The different forms of onanism need not be discussed, nor its practice described, but it is well to call the attention of the public to this vice, since it is so common among the male and female youth of Christendom that it might be regarded as a custom. The danger and result of onanism is insanity. Those persons from whom, as reported by the writers of the gospels, Christ cast out devils and unclean spirits, were in all probability nothing more than onanists or masturbators, or something worse. (2) Satyriasis and nymphomania. An abnormal sexual desire is an intense disturbance in the domain of the feeling and the will, called satyriasis in man and nymphomania in woman. Sexual hyperæsthesia occurs more frequently in women than in men. Persons thus afflicted and laboring under mental exaltations may assume an intensely religious character. Nymphomania has been observed among all kinds of animals. It is rife in religious orders, whose members practice sexual abstinence, give way to religious fervors, and indulge in religious devotion. Sexually excited nymphomaniacs are not uncommonly regarded as very

devout and pious persons. Says Von Kraft-Ebing: "The religious idea of sexual union in the form of marriage; the relation of church and Christ, which is looked upon as that existing between the bride and the groom; the period of puberty, when a state of feeling arising from indistinct sexual sensations is frequently expressed in religious enthusiasm; the history of the saints, in which we are told of the efforts to subdue the flesh; and the practices of certain sects, whose revivals and meetings often become terrible orgies, are proof of the physiological and inner organic relations existing between religious fervor and sexual desire. Of the same nature is the impulse in maniacal virgins to make pilgrimages and do missionary work, or to become nuns, or at least the servants of priests, and they commonly talk much of virtue and virginity." The relation of religion, lust, and cruelty, the same author reduces to the following formula: "States of religious and sexual excitement, at the height of their development, exhibit a correspondence in quantity and quality of excitement, and therefore, under favoring circumstances, one may take the place of the other. Both, under pathological conditions, may become transformed into cruelty." Abol says that "the induction of orgasm by erotic ideas is of special interest on account of the religious significance that has been given it in the imagination of ignorant people." "There is an uncommonly widespread belief that evil spirits of a certain kind possess the power to visit young maidens and wives, and also youths and husbands, while in bed at night, of course always in the seductive form of the opposite sex, in order to perform coitus with them" (Ploss). It is justly assumed that there was a belief in the possibility of cohabitation of a god, since we find that mature maidens who were approaching marriage sacrificed their maidenhood in the temple as a custom. The consorting with devils (usually represented by the priest) comes

to us from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as is well known.

We will pass the abnormal intensification of sexual desires with the remark that it is admitted that "the more undeveloped an individual is, the more reckless is he in the gratification of his desires." Of the numerous sexual perversions, we have *pederasty*, a vice practiced in modern times, and known also among ancients, barbarians, and savages. Contrary sexual instincts are indulged in by both sexes, but do not attain so great an importance among females as males. Paul speaks of it (Romans i, 24): "Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lust of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves; . . . for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly." There are other disgusting vices, sins indulged in by Christians, which are in every way equal to the revolting practices on the island of Ponape. We have to bear in mind that it is not always because of unsatisfied sexual desire that they have resorted *faut de mieux*, but lustful, lascivious, expensive extravagance; these are indulgences of the intelligent wealthy, or persons of means, church attendants, and Christians at that. These sins, vices, or crimes are declared such only when discovered, though it is true that the law prohibits and punishes. What has Christianity accomplished these many centuries in eradicating these evils? Something surely is at fault in the churches, since they have and have had the training and education of childhood and youth before and after puberty. Females before thirteen or fourteen years, and males before fifteen or sixteen, usually have no knowledge of sexual matters. How much has erotic pulpit oratory to do in directing the thoughts

and ideas of the young mind to the generative organs, by the frequent recitals of biblical sexual irregularities of God, the Holy Ghost, etc.? Is it rational or reasonable to suppose for a moment that the sexual pollutions, sins, vices, and crimes, and all other evils due to the same disgusting practices, can be forgiven by a priest, and salvation granted, and heaven attained, or that Christ died for those who practice them?

§ 10. *Did Christ Die for the Sins of Men Forever?*—It is important for humanity, for progressive civilization, for the betterment of man and woman, to know whether a man, a son of God—or God himself—could be sacrificed, or sacrifice himself, to atone for the transgressions, sins, or wrongs arising from over-indulgence of the appetites. Let us apply a little common sense to this inquiry:

1. Can individual excesses (sins), generally or categorically, be forgiven; especially when evils or suffering follow as their consequence? Overloading one's stomach, or eating what does not agree with the digestion, may cause dyspepsia, vomiting, headache, etc., or a still greater organic disturbance is likely to be produced by absorbing an excess of alcohol, inducing diseases of the liver, kidneys, or brain, delirium tremens, etc., for all of which the individual is accountable.

2. Next, we have sins or crimes of necessity—from poverty and starvation on the one hand, extravagance and luxury on the other, with the miseries arising therefrom. Sins of this class may be forgiven, since they are wrongs against man; but infringements against our own constitution, impairment of the health, others cannot forgive. These constitute violations of the laws of nature, and nature is a hard taskmaker, exacting, relentless, merciless. Nature says, Infringe not on my laws and thou shalt not suffer, nor shalt thou experience any of the miseries

or disappointments of life. I will alleviate thy suffering when thou shalt cease to do wrong against thyself. By learning not to do wrong against thyself, thou wilt not do wrong against others.

3. Can sins or crimes committed through the sexual appetites be forgiven? (a) Sins committed, by over-stimulation of the system, against the laws, moral and social rules—assault, seduction, adultery, bigamy. (b) Concubinage, keeping mistresses, indiscriminate sexual intercourse, fornication, etc.

4. (a) Sins of which the law does not directly take cognizance—self-pollution, onanism, or masturbation, by either sex, by whatever means, before and after puberty, and before and after legal marriage. (b) Sexual gratification from perverse instinctive sexual excitement, willfully or through ignorance. (c) Indulgence in lustful sensualities, as a luxury or as a sensuous diversion. (d) Sexual relations of the married, for prudential reasons committing "Fraud-iren" (*coitus interruptus*) to prevent conception. (e) Sexual congress by all sorts of devices for male and female to prevent conception—economizing family.

5. Diseases arising from infection by promiscuous sexual indulgence with public prostitutes, either before or after marriage, as venereal diseases, nervous exhaustion, etc. Nervous debility, the result of excessive indulgence, is well known to the medical profession. It is recommended that individual sexual capabilities should determine the frequency of sexual conversation. It is impossible to fix any standard. Acton allowed but one act of coitus a week; Martin Luther allows two; but, on the other hand, the queen of Aragon recommended six sexual acts a day. "The Talmud directs one coitus a day for a man who is well and strong and not working hard; for a mechanic two a week; while students and laborers are to indulge but once a week." Such advice is easy to give, but not easy to follow, even

for those who have contracted marital unions, with exclusive cohabitation. We may easily conceive conditions where discontent or disagreement arises in consequence of incompatibility or incompetence, when either sex may become unfaithful because of unsatisfied instinctive sexual desires. Religious contemplation, instead of alleviating these carnal wants, rather encourages them. A very devout and pious clergyman, an enthusiast among the females, has confessed to me that, notwithstanding his prayers, no sooner would he come in contact with a lady's dress than he felt a violent sexual impulse, not infrequently accompanied by involuntary waste. He was advised to marry, not to burn; or to try hydropathic treatment.

Excesses of every kind, over-indulgences, undue irritation, irregularities, unnatural excitability of the sexual organs, all come under the denomination of sin, but it is a sin the individual commits against himself, injuring his health and constitution, and slowly undermining his nervous system and mental faculties. Exhaustion, consequent upon unnatural stimulation, ultimately brings the patient to physical and psychological degeneration, with loss of mental activity, memory, etc. Have these sins been forgiven by the death and sacrifice of Christ? If sins of any kind were forgiven nineteen hundred years in advance, it seems to us equivalent to a license. Unfortunately, this sacrifice, this forgiveness, this salvation, is of no earthly benefit to one who has become demoralized and sinful by infringing upon the laws of nature. He or she has to suffer the penalty himself or herself by being deprived of health, constitution, or reason, perhaps becoming afflicted with primary dementia, paranoia, and insanity. Men may forgive one another for wrongs done or crimes committed; and nature may help to repair any damages done to the system, but she never forgives. She puts her seal upon the individual for

trespasses and injuries from which they may never recover. Is it not evident that the appetites are the sin-producing machinery? In animals sin is of no significance, since they have not the brain supply to intelligently discriminate, nor are they held morally or legally responsible; but in man, who possesses greater brain power, greater intelligence and will, we expect that the appetites shall be systematically regulated. Mankind should be instructed by proper training and education to understand that all unnatural sexual indulgence leads to physical and mental ruin, and that the individual must suffer for it. Neither church, Christ, God, nor priest can forgive, and no money can purchase lost organic vitality, nor can decayed mental powers be recovered. With the progress of civilization new sins, wrongs, or crimes are continually cropping up, and new laws are made to regulate them. Fœticide, abortion, forgeries, and various forms of fraud are modern and could not have been forgiven two thousand years in advance.

§ 11. *Spiritual and Carnal*.—All sins directly or indirectly have their origin in the appetites. Theological Christians cleverly apply the *dualistic argument*—the spiritual and the carnal. They claim that there are spiritual sins (which we would interpret to be a mental or psycho-sexual excitement) which the church, ignorantly perhaps, teaches by precept of the pulpit and practice of its gods, earnestly and solemnly filling the imagination of its devotees with the sexualities of religion. We have fairly accurate information that in many schools and academies (nunneries and monastic institutions), and we may include churches, masturbation as a vice is actually cultivated. With a pious prudery biblical sexualities are presented in glowing and glorious colors, veiled in masterly phrases, encouraged by brotherly love and the holy kiss of devotion. How much of

the religious piety exhibited is due to sexual hyperæsthesia, onanism, or nymphomania, we may give a shrewd guess. We know with a degree of certainty that visions, mental delusions, and hallucinations are due to nervous derangements in consequence of sexual abuses. Practical experience must be our guide and reason our interpreter. It is a serious question, but not an improper one, whether a large proportion of the prophets, saints, religious enthusiasts, delusionists, and hallucinationists were not such owing to sexual abuses. The sins of the sexual appetites have been atoned for by God's son. Christianity has acquired a remarkable habit of piling up religious absurdities. It is most singular that the marvels and wonders performed by the Jews and Christians are invariably contrary to nature's laws.

Paul (Acts xxiii, 6) was a Pharisee, son of a Pharisee, and believed in the resurrection, as all Pharisees did. The people (Jews) were divided mainly upon the acceptance or rejection of this belief. The parties were called respectively Pharisees and Sadducees, believers and non-believers. The Pharisees believed that dead bodies could rise after death; the other party did not believe it. The belief in the resurrection of dead bodies did not originate with the Pharisees. They adopted this belief. Paul had neither scruple nor difficulty in accepting the idea of Christ's resurrection; it was his creed. Stoics, ascetics, and others entertained the same notion long before Christ's advent. Let us see how the world was cleansed from sin: "And the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sins" (1 John i, 7); "and he is the propitiation for our sin; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" (ii, 2). "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the father but of the world" (ii, 16). "He that committeth sin is of the

devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning." These contradictory assertions or statements are somewhat perplexing to a reasoning mind, but to the religious intellect, educated in such mental irregularities, the unnatural and irrelevant seem perfectly correct. The average religious man and woman are more or less affected mentally; they are educated into a species of monomania, and their fancies lead them to erect states in the skies, pictures of their imagination; and when stimulated by perverse sexual manifestations, the aberration approaches harmless lunacy.

We read that God created the world; the lust of the flesh is in the world; God created the devil; there are sins of the devil, and the devil sinneth from the beginning, and "Jesus Christ his son" cleanseth us all from sin, and the whole world. Yet all sins arise from the flesh—sexual appetites. All the apostles agree upon that point. Paul says, "meat for the belly and belly for the meat" (1 Corinth. vi, 13). We may accept Paul's description or inventory of sins, as being fairly correct. A few samples will prove instructive: Romans i, 26, 31, "Gave them up unto vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature." "And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another" . . . "being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness," etc. "Without understanding," etc. In 1 Corinthians v, he rails against "fornication, covetousness, drunkards, extortioners;" vi, 9, "Be not deceived; neither fornicators, idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind . . . nor thieves, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God." Verse 16, "What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body?" Galatians v, 19: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery,

fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness." The Ephesians, Colossians, etc., are treated in a similar vein. 2 Timothy i, 9, 10, "Unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers, for murderers of mothers, for manslayers." "For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers," etc. 2 Timothy iii, 2: "For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers," etc; "without natural affections, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce," . . . "lead captive silly women laden with sin, and led away with divers lusts."

If the statement made by the apostles is to be believed, all the sins enumerated by Paul in his epistles have been atoned for by Christ's blood, and by the sacrifice of his body; but neither his death nor his blood seems to have affected the human appetites. Sinning has continued—spiritual, carnal, and venal. Not only have these sins continued to be practiced, but new ones have been introduced (invented) which were unknown in the time of Paul (see p. 86). How long will Christians continue to preach and to teach the idea—a product of hallucination—that a man's blood, or an animal's blood, or the death of a man, no matter who he was or is, can influence the manifestation of our sexual impulses? As in romance and poetry, or the current social gossip, the obscene parts of biblical religion prove most attractive.

No sin is committed by the natural, legal sexual act. Where polygamy or polyandry is legal, it is no sin; where it is prohibited it becomes a sin. The violation of law, natural or human, is a sin, or, when discovered, may become a crime. Sin is a voluntary act, which may be caused by indulgence of a perverted or acquired taste, which, stimulated by sexual instinct, yields temporary pleasurable sensations. Do not let us be deceived into believing that all the noise and excitement of religious enthusiasts is

pure piety and devotion. How much of this exaltation is sexual hyperæsthesia, neurosis, hysteria, neurasthenia, epileptic state, one-sided mental eccentricities, weakmindedness, or even moral insanity, we can properly estimate by comparison with candidates for the insane asylum. How much of the supernatural idea had its birth in the sexual hallucinations, exaltation, hysterical and epileptoid ecstasies, or whether the whole of it is not referable to that source, has not been entirely figured out, but that the sexual instinct dominates all religions we are positive, as we also are that God or gods, and the son of god, originated in the sexual appetites.

§ 12. *Sins of the Appetites in the Holy Roman Catholic Church.*—We are too busy in modern time—too much taken up with immediate pressing wants, with scheming to get wealth, to gain prominence, to become notorious in politics, commerce, or enterprise (though some lead a life of indolence and luxury while others grovel in misery and poverty)—to trouble ourselves about the past. The saying is, “Let the past take care of itself,” and it has always done so, the same as the present takes care of itself, and as the future will take care of itself. But how has the past taken care of itself, and how does the present, wherein we are most concerned, take care of itself? We cannot help glancing backward to discover the wrongs and impositions perpetrated by priestly organizations, which are still practicing the same errors with which our ancestors were deluded and oppressed. Each age in the past has taken care of itself in a manner quite different from that of every other age. Each preceding age had a past of its own, and the past of every age is marked by a point reached in the ascending scale of civilization. Every succeeding past ought to show an improvement, in every branch of human thought, on every

preceding past. Admitting that Christianity was an improvement and an advance on Jehovism, was the Roman Catholic church, that succeeded primitive Christianity, an advance on the teaching of the apostolic fathers?

Papal Christianity was fully established about the sixth century. Previous centuries had been disgraced by the spectacle of rival pontiffs. Crimes, bloodshed, massacres, licentiousness, and sexual excesses were common in and out of the church. Historians make no pretense to extenuate or excuse the profligate lives led by ecclesiastical dignitaries. The animal passions had full swing, and so great was the corruption that both digestive and sexual were freely promiscuously indulged. Baronius, the historian, designated the pope (Boniface III) as the Man of Sin.

Promiscuous sexual intercourse was so openly practiced in the time of Cyprian, the celebrated Bishop of Carthage, who suffered martyrdom A. D. 258, that he introduced the vow of perpetual celibacy, which was enforced upon multitudes of young women in consequence of the numerous scandals and irregularities which naturally sprang from the fruitful source of illicit indulgences. Hence nun, from *nanu*, a word said to be of Egyptian origin, and signifying virgin.

The sexual irregularities in the church are a curious study. Here is an instance: By decree passed at the council held at Ancyra in Galatia, A. D. 314, all ministers were forbidden to marry, except in the case of those who at the time of ordination made an explicit profession of their intention to marry, or when marriage was in their case unavoidable. In such instances a license was granted to the candidate to marry, which secured him from future censures for so doing. If, however, the candidate for ordination was already married he was not obliged to put away his wife, with the following

singular exception, viz.: If he had married a widow, or a divorced person, or a harlot, or a slave, or an actress. The champions of virginity were Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyansen, and Augustine (about the middle of the fourth century). These employed arguments to prove that in some wondrous way the virgin Mary gave birth to the savior without losing her virginity, and some undertook to show in what way this was accomplished. These holy fathers endeavored to establish the notion of the perpetual virginity of Mary, and that she died a virgin. Thus the mother of God was considered worthy of divine worship. Incidentally we may as well mention that at the council of Constance, about the seventh century, it was decided that no faith was to be kept with heretics. The church dignitaries exercised their sexual functions freely, and at times the laity indulged. Irene (who, I believe, became a saint), the wife of Leo IV, was a woman who had rendered her name infamous; she was abominably wicked, says Mosheim, the historian. The barefaced frauds and forgeries practiced, as well as the licentiousness, were an outrage on decency. Pope Stephen claimed to have received a letter direct from Simon Peter; that is, Saint Peter in heaven wrote and sent a letter to Pope Stephen, the infallible postmaster, who in turn dispatched it in all haste to Papin, etc.

Many allusions made to the Dark Ages display a lack of comprehension of their causes and their significance. The Christian Roman Catholic powers, the church, during a period of three hundred years (800-1100 A.D.) plunged humanity into barbarism and savagery—licentiousness, crime, and bloodshed. This period has been designated the Dark Ages, the iron age, the leaden age, the midnight of the world. The corruption of the clergy, says Mosheim, had reached the most enormous height in that dismal period. For the most part they were a worthless set of men, shamefully illiterate, stupid, and igno-

rant, more especially in religious matters; equally enslaved to sensuality and superstition and capable of the most abominable and flagitious deeds. The degeneracy of the sacred order was, according to the most creditable accounts, principally owing to the character of the pretended chiefs and rulers of the universal church, who indulged themselves in the commission of the most odious crimes, and, without reluctance or remorse, abandoned themselves to the lawless impulses of the most licentious passions; who, to satisfy their impious ambitions, confounded in lust all differences between just and unjust, and whose spiritual empire was such a diversified scene of iniquity and violence as was never exhibited under those temporal tyrants who have been the scourge of mankind.

So deep was the ignorance and credulity of the times that the most absurd of fables was received with equal reverence in Greece and in France, and is still enrolled among decrees of the canon law (Gibbon). "The ardor with which relics were sought in the tenth century," observes Mosheim, "surpasses almost all credibility; it had seized all ranks and orders among the people, and was grown into a sort of fanaticism and frenzy; and, if the monks are to be believed, the supreme being interposed in an especial and extraordinary manner to discover to doting old wives and bareheaded friars the places where the bones or carcases of the saints lay dispersed or interred." The bodies of saints were sought by fasting and prayer, instituted by the priest in order to obtain a divine answer and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accomplish their desire; the holy carcass was always found, and always in consequence, as they fraudulently gave out, of the suggestion and inspiration of God himself. About this time the rosary of the virgin was invented. The dissoluteness and profligacy of the monks, the licentiousness

of the nuns, are recorded in the histories of this period. The ignorance was so dense that at a council held in 992 scarcely a single person was to be found in Rome itself who knew the first elements of letters. We have neither time, space, nor disposition to enter into details of the Christian cesspool of vice, licentiousness, and corruption; but we quote a few samples of the infallible heads of the church, showing that the animal sexual appetites were the most dominant influences in the priestly sanctuary. Paul, as we have seen, tells us in plain language of the social and moral condition of his time. We hardly expect to find much improvement among the masses. They were intensely ignorant and superstitious, and the priests were no better. In the seventh and eighth centuries the bishops and cardinals were so illiterate that they could not sign their names to an act passed at the council of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Many of the popes led such profligate lives that historians designated them "monsters of vice."

John VIII was a bloodthirsty tyrant, cruel and unrelenting.

Concerning Sergius III: About the beginning of the tenth century the whole papal power was concentrated in and influenced by three notorious prostitutes—Theodora and her two daughters, Marosia and Theodora. Marosia cohabited with Albert, count of Tuscany, and had by him a son, Alberic. Pope Sergius III, who was raised to the papacy in 904, also cohabited with this woman, and by his holiness she had another son, John, who, through the influence of his licentious mother, afterwards ascended the papal throne. Even Baronius, the popish annalist, confesses that Pope Sergius was the slave of every vice, and the most wicked of men.

John X: This infamous pope was the paramour of the harlot Theodora.

John XI: This pope was the bastard son of his

holiness Pope Sergius. Marosia helped to raise him to the papal dignity.

John XII: This monster of wickedness was a nephew of John the bastard, and was raised to the popedom at the age of eighteen years. His tyranny and debaucheries were abominable. Charges having been brought against him, the Emperor Otto tried to depose him. The emperor says in a letter addressed to him: "You are charged with such obscenities as would make us blush were they said of a stage player. I shall mention to you a few of the crimes laid to your charge; for it would require a whole day to enumerate them all. Know, then, that you are accused, not by some few, but by all the clergy as well as the laity, of murder, perjury, sacrilege, incest with your own two sisters," etc. This pope was caught in bed with a married woman and killed on the spot.

The Abbot Alredus says: "The houses of the priests and monks were brothels for harlots, and filled with assemblies of buffoons; wherein were gambling, dancing and music, and amid every nameless crime, the donations of royalty and the benevolence of princes, the price of precious blood, were most prodigally squandered,"

In the tenth and eleventh centuries, and later on, concubinage was openly practiced by the clergy, and it was regarded by popes and prelates as a far less crime than to marry a wife. "Any person, clergyman or layman, according to the council of Toledo in the seventeenth Canon, who has not a wife but a concubine is not to be repelled from the communion, if he be content with one." Fornication and adultery were sanctioned.

The force of modern civilization has compelled these fossil ecclesiastical institutions to adopt clever tactics to retain the hold they have on the public mind. Every new idea is adopted, so soon as they are able to formulate some kind of plausible ex-

cuse, always bearing in mind profit and loss. That powerful organization, the Catholic church, is making strenuous efforts, not only to hold its own, but to inaugurate aggressive movements to seize everything it can lay its hands on. It accommodates itself to new conditions and circumstances to retain its influence over the masses that the papal fabric may in no wise lose support. Every new move is turned to advantage, with the sanction of the infallible pope. Thus socialism, workingmen's unions, communism—they will even find excuses for anarchy and nihilism. The single tax movement, the anti-poverty—all have been thrown into the ecclesiastical game bag. Both the temperance question and the saloon-keepers' movement receive the support and blessings of the holy father. The evolution theory is slowly being recognized, through the instrumentality of Dr. Zahn. "Evolution, then, is neither a philosophy of mud nor a gospel of dirt." "The evolution of the body of man from some inferior animal and the subsequent endowment in this body by God of a rational soul is antagonistic to no dogma of faith, and may be shown to be in harmony with the teachings of St. Thomas." The supposition is that Dr. Zahn refers to Thomas Aquinas of the thirteenth century, who held that there were two sources of knowledge—the mysteries of the Christian faith and the truths of human reason. Aquinas was a clever theologian in his day, but knew nothing of the theory of evolution. But no matter; the speculative instinct is great in that church, and if it is found profitable and popular we may yet have our progenitors, the monkeys, canonized in the holy sanctuary of the pope. Notwithstanding these monkish sleight-of-hand tricks, the appetites are not much affected. The animal passions are as strong to-day among the priestly orders as they were in the twelfth century. Circumstances differ, and they readily accommodate themselves to the situation. How much these saintly masculini-

ties contribute to man's social degradation is a question not easily solved. The secret highways and by-ways of the confessional witness a multitude of mysterious performances, wherein the sexual appetites play a most important role. The committing and the forgiving of these kinds of sins are so intimately blended, so easily and gracefully exchanged, especially under the shadow and sanction of the holy ministration of a father, that to sin is regarded rather more as a privilege than as a wrong.

Constantine (A. D. 606) marching with his army from France to Italy claimed to have seen a vision in which Jesus Christ appears to him, directing him to make the cross his military symbol.

Ammianus Marcellinus, a Roman historian who lived during these times, adverting to this subject (luxury and grandeur of the bishops) says, "It is no wonder to see those who were ambitious of human greatness contending with so much heat and animosity for that dignity, because when they had obtained it they were sure to be enriched by the offerings of the matrons, of appearing abroad in great splendor, or of being admired for their costly coaches and sumptuous feasts. This led Prætextatus, a heathen, who was prefect of the city, to say, '*Make me Bishop of Rome and I'll be a Christian, too.*'"

§ 13. *Luther's Time.*—Approaching nearer to our own times, we find the moral or social conditions have undergone very little improvement. The holy Roman Catholic priesthood as a sacred class, including popes, cardinals, and bishops, as also the laity, indulged in excessive extravagances of their appetites. Little restraint was practiced, because the church encouraged or granted licenses for the commission of vice, evil, and crime. Sins and how to commit them were a study at the papal court and in churches and monasteries. Schemes were hatched to coin money out of the traffic in vice. The de-

pravity and dissoluteness of the clergy in general were scandalous. They groveled in the dirt of their debauched, corrupt, and licentious lives, and their conduct was countenanced and permitted by the head of the church. A worse class of men could not be found in the history of mankind. The head rulers of the Christian church were Popes Paul II, Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, and Alexander VI, who were all men of vicious and abandoned lives, and appear to have risen successively in the scale of avarice, cruelty, and sensuality; but the masterpiece of all of them belonging to this century was the infamous Alexander VI. Innocent had seven illegitimate children of various amours who were publicly recognized by this vicar of Christ, and became, for the most part, pensioners on the ecclesiastical treasury. But with all his weakness Innocent was animated by a spirit of avarice which attracted attention even in that age of the popedom. And he performed at least one memorable exploit in the design, as it were, to surpass his predecessors by a still bolder insult to the sacred college; he placed among its members a boy thirteen years old, the brother-in-law of his own bastard. But the court of Rome did not resent the indignity—it was sunk even below the sense of its own infamy. As to the Spaniard named Roderic Borgia, who assumed the name of Alexander VI, it would be a tedious and disgusting task to enumerate all the debaucheries, incests, assassinations, and other outrages of which this papal Nero and his equally infamous son, Cardinal Cæsar Borgia, were the guilty perpetrators. He publicly cohabited with a Roman matron named Vanzonia, by whom he had five acknowledged children. Neither in his manner nor in his language did he affect any regard for morality or for decency; and one of the earliest acts of his pontificate was to celebrate with scandalous magnificence, in his own palace, the marriage of his daughter, Lucretia. On

one occasion this prodigy of vice gave a splendid entertainment within the walls of the Vatican to no less than fifty public prostitutes at once, and that in the presence of his daughter Lucretia, at which entertainment deeds of darkness were done over which decency must throw a veil*; and yet this monster of vice was, according to papists, the legitimate successor of the apostles and the vicar of God on earth, and was addressed by the title of His Holiness. What a tale might be told, would space permit, of the robberies, murders, adulteries, incests, and other crimes; or of the outrageous fraud promulgated by the infamous Tetzl: "The very moment the money jingles in the chest the soul for whom it is paid escapes from the pains of purgatory and flies to heaven." Many of these outrages, of course in a disguised and modified form, still continue. If it is not a Tetzl it is a Satolli, the holy apostolic ablegate sent here to look after the papal revenues. While these abominations were practiced in and out of church with the sanction of popes, cardinals, and priesthood, they were persecuting men for criticising and expressing opinions contrary to the papal doctrine and principle. Thus Huss, Latimer, Ridley, and others, had to suffer the penalty of burning at the stake. Machiavelli, who lived in Florence at the time when Luther went to Rome, remarked: "The greatest symptom of the approaching ruin of Christianity is that the nearer we approach the capital of Christendom the less we find the Christian spirit in the people. The scandalous examples and crimes of the court of Rome have caused Italy to lose every principle of piety and every religious sentiment. We Italians," continues the great historian, "are principally indebted to the

* These infamous debaucheries are related with much more minuteness than is consistent with modern refinement and delicacy by Burchardus (Div. 77).

church and to the priests for having become infamous and profligate." Luther found in his visit to Rome "ignorance, levity, and dissolute morals, a profane contempt for everything sacred, and a shameful traffic in divine things." He further remarks, "It is incredible what sins and atrocities are committed in Rome." He was wont to say: "If there be a hell, Rome is built above it; it is the abyss from whence all sins proceed." Years later he said, "The nearer we approach Rome the greater the number of bad Christians we find." "It is commonly observed that he who goes to Rome for the first time seeks a knave there; the second time he finds him; and the third time he brings him away under his cloak. But now the people are becoming so clever that they make the three journeys in one." This immense religious fabric, called Christianity, jammed with pious fraud and corruption, has been erected on the ignorance and stupidity of the masses. It is a colossal institution, having for its foundation a ridiculous incident, an irregular indulgence of the sexual appetites, the most absurd that was ever conceived in the imagination of man. It is no wonder that so much rottenness is found in the doctrine and teachings of the church. Let us put the transactions of the trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in plain, popular language: A Jew God sends his representative, the Holy Ghost, to have illicit intercourse with a Jew girl, the wife of a carpenter, in order to beget a son, of whom God is the father, and whom he intends to kill as a sacrifice for the sins of the world, the sins of men—that is, for the over-indulgence of the digestive and sexual appetites! Can any sensible man or woman conceive anything more absurd, indecent, or outrageous than this idea? This monstrous doctrine is taught in our public schools, sanctioned by the church, legalized by the legislatures, countenanced by the public authorities. And we call ourselves civilized—we that still wor-

ship this sexual abomination, the relics of our semi-barbarous ancestors! Why should children be compelled to listen to the reading of the nauseating story of the immaculate conception? Why should children be made to pray to the bastard son of a Jew God? Is it not time to abolish this filthy reminder of Jehovah's sexual intercourse?

The officers of the Roman chancery published a book containing the exact sum to be paid for the forgiveness of every particular sin. A deacon guilty of murder was absolved for twenty crowns. A bishop or abbot might assassinate for three hundred livres. An ecclesiastic might violate his vows of chastity, even under the most aggravating circumstances, for the third part of that sum; and the work added, among other items: "Take notice particularly that such graces are not granted to the poor, for not having the wherewith to pay they cannot be comforted."

Under the pious dispensation of Pope Leo X, sins were forgiven before they were committed: "Sins you shall hereafter desire to commit shall be forgiven you." "There is no sin so great that the indulgence cannot remit, and even if any one should ravish the Holy Virgin, mother of God, let him pay—let him pay largely, and it shall be forgiven him." These vulgar, grosser methods can no longer be employed, for the people ridicule them, but the same traffic in a refined form is still carried on by the holy representatives of God. Popery has not changed, except in outward appearance. You cannot change the nature of the beast by clipping his ears or docking his tail. So long as that institution deals in confession, repentance, salvation, forgiveness, holy water, relics, idols, indulgences, hell, heaven, and purgatory, this swindling ecclesiastical traffic will be a profitable business; man and woman will be corrupt and improvement almost impossible; and were it not for the fact that civilization had

been pushed forward by secular intelligence, by men of wisdom and scientific attainment, who put their secular opinion in opposition to pestiferous ecclesiasticism, we would to-day be buried in the mire of popery.

§ 14. *The Social Evil—Biblical and Modern.*—What have the Catholic and Protestant churches done since Luther's time? Have they not had complete ecclesiastical control of all the populations of civilized Europe and America? Have they not filled every place and office under every system of government? Are they not the dictators, framers, and exemplars of morals in every community? Are they not the preachers, teachers, and leaders of the members of society from childhood to maturity? Do they not possess immense wealth, properties, and influence? Are they not all-powerful in civil governments? Are they not traveling from door to door with the Bible in one hand and an empty purse in the other? Are they not sending missionaries out to remote regions to convert the savage and the heathen, while the vast majority of the civilized population at home are sinners? Have not at least the Protestant Christians in recent times been trying to suppress the vice or evil arising from the appetites?

We have temperance societies and temperance unions and prohibition, for the stomach; and we have the new name, "social evil"—a refined modern term for characterizing collectively all the evils the ancients were guilty or capable of, and much more of which our ancestors knew nothing. How is it possible to regulate social evil by the Bible, or the holy scripture, as it is reverently called, when that book is full of social evil recitals? Does it ever strike our Christian brethren that the very begetting of Jesus Christ was a social-evil act? Does not this Jehovistic scandal come under this euphemistic

title of social evil? If the statement of Matthew and Luke be true, Mary, the wife of Joseph, was either seduced or committed adultery, and these certainly find their place among social evils. And God was guilty—either by himself or by proxy—of a social-evil delinquency. We have not in this instance an excess, but an irregular indulgence of the sexual appetites, which in our modern state is considered a grievous wrong and a sin. Does it not, then, appear clear to every intelligent man and woman that the very corner-stone of Christianity is a social evil? How can theological Christians hope either to suppress or eradicate it? Girls and boys are too intelligent to believe in immaculate conception and the miraculous begetting of a son, or to be deceived about what the sexual organs are for. Your fertilizer is bad, your teachings are mischievous and vicious, and your fruit is rotten. Christianity, with its vulgarity and grossness, must ever be a failure. It necessarily leads to vice and corruption, because the social evil act is constantly and glaringly exhibited before the mental vision of its devotees, and they are ever reminded of the act which God's Holy Ghost accomplished with a virgin, another man's wife. Young women ponder over it, reflect upon it, kneeling and praying to a prettily carved nude male figure, "would that the Lord would only help them to do the same." Passion and a longing desire heat their infatuated brains, and they fancy they experience, or hope to experience, celestial joy and happiness—which is finally realized, under exciting and artificial stimulation, in the gratification of the sexual appetite. What will not a superstitious young girl imagine, under nervous excitement, due to ovarian functions, the awakening of sexual appetites? Do these Christian priests and preachers, or ministers of the gospel, believe that intelligent young men of modern times have not the correct conception and understanding of the pretended mys-

terious significance of the relations between the Holy Ghost and the young woman? It is useless to try to spiritualize and sanctify this peculiar phase of the social evil. Are they not very prone to ask why, since God sanctions it by his act, any better warrant should be demanded of them than is furnished by his example? Is it not a spiritual delusion, an absurd religious hallucination, inviting them to imitate this miraculous sexual performance? And to what extent has not the priestly celibacy directly or indirectly aided and abetted the social evil by rousing the appetites through the confessional; by instilling impure thoughts; by reminding the penitent of desires and passion never dreamt of; by exciting their fancy and stimulating their lust? Again, the monstrous plea that the spirit is weak and the flesh strong is always a sufficient excuse for every licentious priest or preacher. It never occurs to the Christian mind that the nervous, mental enthusiasm cannot repress the sexual impulse, and that prayer is of no avail when virility is dominant. The Homoeopathic principle does not apply in all cases; like does not cure like, and you cannot cure the social evil by teaching social evil, whether of Old or New Testament origin.

We cannot fail to take cognizance of another fact, namely, that as civilization advances this social evil assumes new forms under new theories, new economic conditions, and new restrictions under new laws. The evil itself has existed in all civilized ages, but the modern form is more refined and seductive than that of any previous age. Our social evil assumes phases peculiar to the times in which we live: as commercial, medical, artistic, scientific, literary, musical, domestic, religious, charitable, fashionable, etc. In fact, the social evil travels and parades under a hundred different disguises, evading the civil laws in every possible way, without giving even a thought to religious matters. The organiza-

tions which have for their object the eradication of the social evil have no doubt the best intentions, but unfortunately the persons employed as officials and detectives are not infallible, nor are they incorruptible, or uninfluenced by the power of money. Their scruples, by reason of being employed in that capacity, are not of the finest. No sooner is a man employed in an official capacity by any society for the purpose of prying into other people's business, than he must, by the very nature of his trade, lie and deceive. Bribery and corruption are the elements he lives in; very similar to the holy Roman Catholic church, he is a person prone to grant privileges for pay. Social evil is a disease of the sexual appetites. Cure it at one spot and it will break out at another; suppress it in one locality and it will flourish elsewhere; drive it from any place and it will find new quarters. It is found to exist everywhere. No place is too exalted or sacred, none too degraded. It seems to be the real representative of that fiction called Satan, for it is all-powerful and ever-present. A proper education, a scientific training, a healthy understanding, is wanted; but so long as the scriptural social evil is preached or taught, so long as greed and selfishness are encouraged, and luxury and extravagance form the principal Sunday exhibits in the churches, so long as delusion and fraud remain the chief corner-stone of Christianity, and sins of sex are articles of priestly traffic, it will be found impossible to eradicate this social evil and its kindred frauds and crimes. We cannot remedy our modern evils by clothing ancient sexual offenses in the garb of sanctity and worshiping them as miraculous and divine. Purge the social evil out of your Christianity before you attempt to purify society with it. How much longer will the church continue to teach mischievous doctrines of nineteen centuries ago, under a saintly garb on the one hand, and try to cure the same evil with modernized ec-

clesiasticism on the other? And so long as the picture of that holy adulteress, the mother of Jesus, representing the very emblem of sexual irregularity, decorates our public thoroughfares with the inscription, "The blessed Virgin Mary, immaculate mother of God," just so long will civilization be unable to suppress the social evil.

APPENDIX.

1. *An imperceptible movement*, a silent agitation, amounting almost to a revolution, has for years been going on, and is still going on, in the minds of men respecting church, worship, religious beliefs, creeds, dogmas, and teachings. This intelligent, quiet revolt is far greater and more deeply rooted than the public generally is aware, or the ecclesiastical authorities are willing to admit. The hindrances and impediments formerly placed in the way of mental progress by Christianity under the sway of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, whose power was almighty, have had gradually to yield to the pressure of modern scientific reform. Ancient misconceptions, mysteries, miracles, wonders and delusions, have been cleared up and explained, and sufficiently demonstrated to be nothing more than gross errors of ignorance and superstition. Religious fabrics in their development out of early conceptions had to undergo changes and modifications, and were more or less subject to whims, fancy, and inexperience, as the faculties of the human mind enlarged. The introduction of new ideas could no more be avoided in past ages than they can be at present. It is the inevitable result of mental evolution that religious ideas shall replace and succeed each other in the natural course of events. Ideas, indefinite at first, assume in time a tangible form, and evolve into fixed rules for the guidance or government of men,

yet they are still only of a temporary character. Rules, beliefs, creeds, religious worship, or ceremonies, are like fashions, subject to transformation and reformation when ideas better adapted to new conditions, circumstances, and necessities are suggested to the minds of men by evils or injuries arising from prevailing teachings or habits of acquired thought. Attempts at remedies are at first cautiously made, with the intent to change existing opinions and to elicit an expression of sentiment or feeling on the subject. Prescribed and limited modes of thought, which are kept stationary by existing ecclesiastical authorities, for their own selfish interests, cannot be so maintained indefinitely. With stagnation of ideas, the world is like a neglected garden, which is sure to become weedy for want of culture and improvement—a condition which cannot long continue, for no sooner are the bad effects realized than a reaction sets in. The movement, almost imperceptible at first, gathers strength as the perceptive faculties of the masses develop, as their powers of observation are aroused, and as a higher intelligence is acquired, enabling them to view the priestly teachings of the ancients by the light of modern culture.

2. *Religion*, ancient or modern, never had any scientific stability, or solid basis to rest upon. In no age has it been anything more than a series of moral and social experiments. It is no nearer sound principles to-day, though disguised in modern dress and decorated with civilized paint, than it was ages ago. Whatever reason the originators of the scheme may have had for establishing religion (and we may presume that, since it constituted their political life, they had some use for it), we have no use for it now whatever. Existing remnants of the theological riddle puzzle only the ignorant, weak-minded, and superstitious, or the morbidly devotional. It mysti-

fies only those who readily accept any explanation, who are eager to believe any kind of fanciful statements made by priests or preachers, and who are not expected (nor do they expect, on their part) ever to be capable of reasoning. The priest or preacher who claims to be the infallible agent of the celestial powers, the holy Trinity, never reasons; he has not been trained to reason, and nothing reasonable is expected of him. His self-esteem and conceit, combined with a narrow-mindedness, resulting from a strictly biased education, coupled with a nervous system easily excited into a delusive state of exaltation, actually succeed in persuading him that he is really different from other men. In the vast majority of cases this apparent sanctity is not the real motive which actuates, and, for physical and physiological reasons, it cannot be that motive. So long as animal nature forms the foundation of human nature, the carnal part of man will demand attention first; the appetites must be satisfied before the spiritual man can assume control. The real motive lies in the appetites, greed and selfishness. The primary and all-important object of the church is to inculcate the precepts concerning the holy trinity which are incorporated in the creeds and dogmas. But of what earthly use or benefit to mankind are these? They have been proved not only useless, but injurious, since belief in religious absurdities tends to weaken the mind, and to encourage vicious practices rather than to suppress them. If religion were founded on fact, or had some positive principle to sustain it, there would be no need for constant changes of opinion about it. The ancient conception of a god in the form of a magnified man had not the slightest stability, and this accounts for its slow but sure decay. Had the original deistic conception been as now claimed by the Christian world, had the deity been conceived of as impersonal, there would have been no necessity

to remodel him. But if the God of the ancient Jews and modern Christians did not possess exaggerated human attributes, why was it necessary to bring the sexual appetites into activity in order to magnify his importance and to provide him with second and third assistants? What impotence or defect was discovered in his make-up, we are not informed, but it is very evident that alone he was found incompetent to cope with the human appetites. The history of his career bears testimony to his failure to manage his own people. Did the progressive mind of the period discover the inadequacy of the monotheistic idea, and premeditatedly and intentionally set up the trinity; was it an accident of the times, or was it a spontaneous growth and development? Whenever an unsatisfactory state of affairs exists it is a sign of the weakness and instability of the authorities or organized powers. None of the religious systems had a stable basis, and so pantheism, polytheism, monotheism, trinitarianism, and the rest, including liberal Christianity, have successively undergone reformation.

3. *At the Present Time.*—There are but two or three classes who still cling to the religious idea: First, the clergy, who are financially interested; second, the wealthy, to whose interest it is to be church supporters; and, third, the ignorant, superstitious, and feeble minded. The better informed, the greater brained, the thinking classes, who form from two-thirds to three-fourths of the entire population of civilized nations, have lost all faith in Christianity. Though trained in childhood in this system, in maturity they forsake it.

Innovation or reformation always proves unpleasant to existing organizations. United bodies of men, who combine for the purpose of exercising authority, power, and influence and for profits and emoluments, do not voluntarily relinquish their

hold. Religious organizations are composed of men who are not differently constituted from other men; they are not free from animalism, money greed, or sexual instincts; nor do they enjoy the satisfaction of their appetites less than other human beings. In past ages they were the law-makers, the governors and rulers of men; they were the disciplinarians, guides, and teachers. Their creed consisted chiefly of (1) the Mosaic precepts of piety; (2) additional precepts of piety evolved out of the deity's increase of family, the trinity; (3) a discipline of the appetites by a salvation process; (4) forcing the masses to believe that which neither priest nor layman knew anything about; (5) that the souls of men could not be saved without belief in the illegitimate son of an ordinary woman. This, in brief, forms the stock in trade of their organization. The rules of conduct for the guidance of mankind are embodied in our secular civil laws, and have been so, more or less complete, for several centuries, relieving the church of responsibility in the matter. The ecclesiastical authorities, after many ages of trial and experiment, having entirely failed, by their methods, to discipline and regulate man's appetites, the civil organizations, the governing bodies of men, pass laws and enforce them for that purpose. Thus even the inefficient precepts of probity are no longer subject to clerical dominion, and the priestly commerce is apparently restricted to the precepts of piety, comprising the five Mosaic precepts of that class and those contained in the articles of Christian faith. The church relies for its support on those who believe in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who in prayer express their dependence on God, either to win his favor, to appease his wrath, to obtain some gift or blessing, or to gain some advantage. We must presume that God has a mind or will, faculties, and understanding; otherwise prayers would be useless. Then we have the doctrine of atonement

and intercession through the mediation of Jesus Christ. The mediators between God and man differ in the different churches. The Catholic includes the Virgin Mary, saints, and angels. This same church claims that God, Christ, and the interceders understand only Latin. The Protestants present their divinities as polyglots. Forgiveness of sin, prayer for the dead, etc., constitute so many articles of piety to trade in. It stands to sense, if the various precepts or staple articles were abolished, or the people ceased to believe in them, the *raison d'être* would also cease to exist. Another form of addressing prayer by invocation to the blessed spirits claimed by the Roman Catholic church to be with God, declares that "the saints who reign with God offer up their prayers to God for man; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help for the purpose of obtaining benefits of God through his son Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Savior." With the inauguration of this system by the church it established a series of praying agencies and sub-praying agencies, mediators and sub-mediators, for the benefit of those who may require aid or benefits through dead men converted into saints. Protestants object to the invocation of saints and angels, and deny the efficacy of prayer to the Virgin Mary. Christians do not all take the same prayer route. The Catholic church establishes new agencies with every new saint they make, while the Protestants select the via celestial to suit their taste or inclinations. There is nothing positive in the system. Except the substantial money part it is loose and arbitrary enough to accommodate the existing moral conscience, circumstances, and conditions; each one interpreting the manner of proceeding corresponding to the mental state and physical inclination. Of practical value to the individual it has absolutely none, except that

prayer is regarded either as a moral tonic, a sedative, a nervine, a stimulant, or an excitant. We cannot fail to comprehend the degrading position, the mean, contemptible attitude necessary to supplicate, to submit, to depend, to pray, and invoke, personally or through others, for favors which in all the experience of man have never been realized. A helpless individual remains helpless, except when assisted by his fellow-man, for none of these religious agencies can render or ever has rendered any assistance to humanity. Where in the universe can man and woman find help if they do not help themselves by their own exertions, their own skill and ingenuity? Why make man or woman dependent, hopeful, and indolent by prayer, when nature demands the exercise of energy, physical or mental force, in order to compete in the struggle for existence? Why mislead the weak-minded by holy shams, saintly mockeries, sacred delusions, pious deceptions, and ecclesiastical frauds? Who ever obtained relief in case of poverty, distress, or affliction except at the hands of human beings? How can any relief be given, or assistance rendered, by any other medium than that of man or woman? The best of prayers, the sublimest composition addressed with the profoundest solemnity, through the mediumship of dead men or women, to the unseen, supernatural phantom God avails man or woman practically nothing. It may have a pacifying effect, a sort of hypnotic influence, a reflex nervous action, which the words, by their meaning, convey to the mind, but nothing more.

4. *The Lord's Prayer*.—Take for example the Lord's prayer, the best of its kind. What effect has the repetition of that prayer upon the suppliant individual? The impression is different upon different persons. When one repeats in a devotional mode, "Our father which art in heaven," he designates the resi-

dence or abode of God, transporting himself in the imagination to whatever region presents itself to his mind, "the celestial region depending entirely on the creative power of the mind and the terrestrial grandeur and luxury experienced. Heaven may be made to vary from the simplest and plainest to the most gorgeous and extravagant." In the next phrase he expresses a sentiment of honor towards the deity—"hallowed be thy name." This constitutes a pious precept. The good derived from the sentence would be equal to the good one may derive from saying, "John Jones, which art in the sky, honored be thy name." The effect in both instances is the same, though the impression upon the imagination may perhaps be different. In the next sentence, the devotee wishes for something of which he has not the remotest notion, and he conceives a state of things that is purely imaginary, as, "thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is heaven." Evidently this was composed at a period when kingdoms, combined with tyranny, were the existing form of government, and the speaker wished and hoped to realize a mode of life more congenial to his feelings and aspirations—a state of ease and comfort as he understood it, or as his fancy painted heaven. Neither man nor woman can wish for anything that does not indirectly stand in relation to or bear upon the appetites. If the Christian prays that God's kingdom may come on earth it is with the anticipation of obtaining all the good things the appetites may long for, the same that he would enjoy in heaven. Oh, this *chateau d'Espagne*, where the weary rest from care, where trouble would cease. We are to be dressed in white garments, with music and plenty of everything to satisfy the appetites, each one gratified according to his sense of pleasure, and, what is still more delightful to anticipate, there will be no work, no worry, no poverty and no distress. This is a pious but very selfish

wish, hoping and longing for that agreeable state of indolence and luxury which, it is imagined, exists in the heavenly kingdom. "Give us this day our daily bread." The strong man helps himself, the strong animal does the same. This begging for bread is a personal appeal, and is indicative of poverty of both mind and body. The nobler characteristics of manhood and of humanity are entirely absent. What kind of a man is it that will beg bread of another? The expression is calculated to soothe, pacify, and give hope to the bondman or slave. The lowly, inferior man stoops, and bends the pliant knee soliciting bread or alms. This very dependence lowers a man not only in his own esteem, but in that of others. This personal expression, "And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," is a human precept, and conveys a double meaning—good or bad, as the case may be. "Do to us as we do to others" depends entirely on the disposition, culture, and education of the one who utters it. "Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil," continues the prayer. The only temptations known to men or beasts are those of the appetites. Singular, that God the father should be implored not to lead men into temptation. That he should lead them into temptation first, and then be requested to deliver them from evil, is inconsistent with the conception of God. If Satan led them into temptation, no one could object, but such meanness is unworthy of man, and much more of God. One might be delivered from evil, if he committed any sin or wrong against himself or others, by the skillful aid of men; that is, if the evil be of a character that nature cannot cure. These three personal appeals for aid—for bread, forgiveness of debt, and not to be led into temptation—exhibit a pusillanimity of character entirely unworthy of manhood or womanhood. One lacking the qualities indicated is weak, mean-spirited, and cowardly. No such prayer can

affect the conditions in this earthly existence; struggle he must, and the fittest will survive.

In the last sentence of the prayer several attributes are assigned to God: "For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory forever." They were evidently believers in monarchy, because with kingship go power and glory. This condition was the highest conception of government the authors of the prayer had in mind when they composed it, and it was a perfectly natural utterance. But what benefit can a citizen of a republic derive from such a prayer? He is no believer in kingdoms, kingly power, or kingly glory.

What man or woman is so stupid as not to have learned from experience that everyone must earn his bread? Suppliantly asking for bread, without hope of receiving what is solicited, is contrary to common sense and reason. As to the second personal appeal, to have one's debts forgiven, there are benevolent people, perhaps, actuated by generous motives, who occasionally forgive debts, but to appeal to God, the celestial specter, to either give bread or forgive debts, is dishonestly wasting time. Human beings are so constituted, animal greed and selfishness so preponderate, that they are not very apt to forgive their debtors. As to being led into temptation, meaning sensual desires and passions (sexual appetites), or delivered from evil—that is, from excessive indulgences or illegal acts—it is admitting that the individual praying has no control over himself, that he is devoid of strength of character, and is likely to yield to every impulse of his appetites. If prayers are promises to ourself to become better, without having the proper intelligence and will-power to be better, prayer is useless; the individual who attempts to delude himself and others is, in other words, a hypocrite. A man or woman, sufficiently intelligent to know what is right, and do it; also what is wrong and do it not, performs his or her duty himself or

herself, as well as to others. The thoughts, ideas, and understanding of a modern intelligent freeman are quite different from the thoughts, ideas, and understanding of an ignorant, superstitious barbarian, slave, or bondman. When prayer, worship, etc., were invented, men and women were much lower in the scale of civilization than at present, and had not reached that high degree of intelligence which would have enabled them to exercise their will-power and reason. Religion is not, properly speaking, an educational process; it never appeals to the intellect or understanding; its moral or social influence is at best of a transient character. A man or woman may for a very short time feel good after repeating prayers, and then, without the slightest compunction, relapse into vicious indulgences of the appetites, knowing, as taught by the church, that the heavenly father, through the priest and prayer, will forgive the sin. It is a very easy way of balancing accounts. One may pray, then sin—or first sin and then pray—without cost; although, if the sin be of an aggravated kind, the priest then acts as the middleman and forgives at a reasonable price.

This religious system of worship and prayer blunts the conscience, the intelligence, and the higher sense of honor in the lower and humbler classes, who are busy the greater part of their time in gaining a subsistence, and have little leisure left to acquire a systematic education. Legislative enactments cannot put common sense and reason into the minds of man or woman—it requires culture. The numerous laws that have been passed to regulate the appetites have given us abundant evidence of their futility. If the repetition of the meaningless words composing a prayer is useless to man, how much more ridiculous and degrading are the Roman Catholic gymnastics performed during worship. Every age, every century, evolves its own methods of training and educating its young, whether they be

heathen, pagan, or Christian. The rate of advancement, the degree of progress, depends largely on climatic influences. Where the greatest energy is displayed, physically and mentally, they proportionately maintain prestige and influence and command respect, and are the gainers and holders of wealth, both individual and national. The least thrifty people are the least successful; they are usually the most primitive and the weakest, regardless of religious cult (or piety), which has no part or place in modern civilization. These necessarily fall under the ban and destruction of the more enlightened nations. Our educational institutions are vastly superior to those of past ages, and so are the people intellectually. Superior intelligent nations cannot and will not tolerate inferior teachers, even if they are called Christians.

Christianity is no longer wanted among civilized races. Japan, which, until her recent victories over China, was regarded by Christians as a heathen nation and her people as barbarous, has demonstrated to the world that she is as highly civilized and as progressive as the most enlightened Christian country. Christians are ever ready with their missionary work to make converts and conquests. These religious commercial enterprises, stimulated by rapacity and greed, backed by powerful fleets and armies, invade lands occupied by non-civilized or barbarous races in order to establish their Christian missions—the great colonization scheme of the world, conducted by the Bible and sword. Christians have appropriated all the available land in the world on Christian principles, at the cannon's mouth. The educational advancement of Japan has caused the people to assert their self-respect, dignity, and honor, and they resent the insults offered by Christian missionary teachers, who have made a series of attempts to introduce their semi-barbarous beliefs and creeds. They refuse to submit to the tutelage

of Christian missionaries who pretend to swallow their god and to drink his blood. They consider themselves fully capable of managing their own affairs in matters of discipline, of war, commerce, religion, and education.

5. *Missions*.—According to Dr. Johnson (missionary), the Japanese regard the efforts of the missionaries to assist them as a reflection on their ability. "The Japanese do not bear any hatred for foreigners," says the doctor, "but their government insists that the co-operation between its subjects and missionaries and teachers shall cease" (Report of the American Board of Foreign Missions, Sept. 17, 1895). The lesson we learn about this civilized nation, enlightened Japan, in refusing Christian missionaries to teach or educate their people is undoubtedly true. They do not esteem the Christian belief very highly, and consider it inferior to their own. Scholars in Japan, as in Europe and elsewhere, do not consider the Christian missionary system, with its creeds and doctrines, as suitable for any intelligent people. They demand and require educational methods superior to trinitarianism. Cultured minds everywhere reject these sexually created gods, however well calculated Christianity may be to impress barbarians or savages, who, mentally, are constituted very similarly to the uncultivated and semi-savage race among whom Christianity was first promulgated. Missionaries succeed well among the Negroes and other African races, and among semi-barbarians elsewhere. After having purchased their good will with a few cheap trinkets, they may easily persuade these to believe in Christianity. The African, who is ignorant, superstitious, and credulous, is easily made submissive through the miraculous effect of European powder. It is one thing to influence these primitive races with the wonderful and the miraculous, but quite another

when the missionaries come in contact with an intelligent nation. He who in the childish mental state readily absorbs fables and ghost stories, and finds them interesting and entertaining, laughs at his infantile credulity when his brain has been cultivated and he has arrived at the age of discretion. Men may become good mechanics, sober workmen, industrious citizens, brave soldiers, and daring sailors without believing in God, Christ, and the Christian system. The greatest classical scholars, philosophers, historians, students, statesmen, and leaders of armies, before Christ, were heathens; and to-day our greatest scientists, discoverers, philosophers, and scholars are non-Christians. Christianity has had as little to do with producing these mighty intellects of the present age, or with the progress of civilization, as it had to do in developing the classical minds of Greece before Christianity. The church has been manufacturing Christians for nineteen hundred years, and what is the result? Men and women are still sinners and still sinning. In the line of salvation little or nothing has been accomplished except bombastic show, self-puffed up importance. The flattering unctious which Christians lay to their mental conceit, that Christianity has chiefly caused this world's progress, is entirely gratuitous; it is much like accusing a fly of moving an elephant. They would have us believe that the Christian religion promoted the arts, sciences, and discoveries, but they must undeceive themselves. Humanity would have been far more advanced had not the holy church, by its intolerance and despotism, caused an arrest of mental development. Several centuries before Christ literature and scientific education were gaining ground; they had made considerable progress and were pursued with energy, eagerness, and perseverance by the heathens and pagans of Greece and other nations. Christianity, all-powerful in the Roman church, brought the in-

tellectual machinery to a standstill and made further progress impossible. For fifteen hundred years, until the Reformation, the intellectual wheels of humanity were almost motionless. Then sufficient mental freedom was gained for the introduction of pagan classics, literary and scientific work, into the educational system of Christendom, and the cerebral hemispheres gained once more an opportunity to exercise their normal functions.

The world is in no way indebted to Christianity for its civilization and progress. We must take into consideration climatic influences and brain development. We only need make comparison between the Southern and the Northern nations of Europe. Those occupying a temperate latitude of 12° to 158° perhaps, extending from 43° to 55° north of the equator, which may be termed the intellectual zone, are masters of the world—England, France, and Germany for example. Let us remember that neither religion, church, nor worship—neither God, Christ, nor Holy Ghost, can in any way influence the progress of nature. These are but the inventions of man. They are nothing more than the schemes, experiments, and speculations of humanity, ever subject to change, modification, reformation, or total abolition.

6. *Are We a Christian Nation?*—The United States of America has an estimated population of seventy millions, and is usually classed as a Christian nation. The combined churches, including all denominations, claim a membership of twenty millions. The religious organizations are divided into two camps—Catholics the one, Protestants the other. Catholics as a unit are powerful in everything they undertake. Protestantism is split up into one hundred or more sects or religious factions. There are about one hundred and forty thousand churches, and a total church wealth of nearly a billion of dol-

lars, or about one twenty-sixth part of the entire assessed valuation of the property of the United States. There are therefore fifty million people in the United States who are not associated with any church organization; they are non-church-goers and presumably non-Christians.

Notwithstanding that Christians are largely in a minority, they govern the nation. They are the holders of offices, the makers and administrators of the law, and reap the benefits of patronage. The churches, directly or indirectly, are the controllers of wealth, the directors of political and social affairs, and the guardians of our public schools. The education of our children is in the hands of Christians; they are raised and mentally fed on Christianity. There is hardly an official in the national, state, or city government, from the president to the constable, who is not a Christian of some sort.

What, we would ask, has Christianity accomplished? Where has humanity profited by its teachings, when all the practicers of corruption, vice, crime, fraud, and forgery, including the social evil, are church disciples? More than two-thirds of the population of this country do not belong to any church organization, have little or no belief, and neither pray nor worship. What are these fifty millions of people who place no faith in the Christian religion, who do not attend church or belong to any ecclesiastical organization? Even the most pious must concede that they are intelligent, well-behaved, well-conducted, law-abiding citizens. They pursue their chosen occupations and professions, and are patriots, as loyal to their country as any believer. If newspaper testimony is of value we must arrive at some very unpleasant conclusions as to the criminal classes. Corruption, bribery, and fraud are not unknown in Congress or legislature; our jails and penitentiaries are filled with all kinds of criminals, and of those who indulge in vice, social

evil, and law-breaking, and who keep our courts busy—all, all are Christians. These people, with few exceptions, have had Sunday-school training and sincerely believe that their sins are forgiven, or will be, and that Jesus Christ is their Lord and savior. The criminal, even the depraved murderer, before he pays the penalty of his misdeeds with his life, is persuaded by some whining priest or preacher that he may die a good, believing Christian's death, and that his soul will be saved, thus giving the vilest sinner a chance to become a saint. Christians are the ruling classes, the wealthy aristocrats, the politicians of the nation, who furnish the law-makers as well as the law-breakers. They furnish the saints and the sinners. The vast majority of the nation are evidently non-believers; they have dismissed Christianity, with its creeds, doctrines, and teachings; they are no longer followers of gods or of Christ, but FOLLOWERS OF REASON.

The vast majority of non-church-going people spend their Sunday, the day of rest, in a manner most agreeable to their taste, intelligence, or inclination. The church yields them no satisfaction. They find it neither amusing, instructive, nor recreative. The religious representatives know full well that their places of worship are not overflowing with worshipers, and that, excepting in some wealthy churches where luxury, gorgeousness, and costly music are the attractive features, a majority of preachers waste their eloquence on empty seats. They admit that their seating capacity is twice as large as their attendance, and there is as much competition between the various denominations to attract or allure people to church as there is in the ordinary lines of business. Ecclesiastical bodies, not unlike other combinations of men, conduct their affairs on principles calculated to make the business remunerative, profitable, and successful. The means they employ to gain wealth, money, and influence

are no different from the means employed by all men ; but they have the advantage of conducting their traffic in the name of God, Christ, and the Ghost. Notwithstanding the immense falling off of membership, the loss of faith in the church, the rejection of Christ worship, and the incredibility in their system, they are still the power directing public and private affairs. The masses have grown too intelligent and too enlightened by our modern educational system to permit themselves to be swayed by teachings suited only to a semi-barbarous people.

We must concede that these fifty millions of free, independent, enlightened non-believing persons exercise their will power more intelligently and judiciously follow the dictates of reason in preference to decaying religious opinions. We have arrived at a time and age when there is needed a reformation conforming to the intelligence of the masses as they are now, not as they were a thousand or two thousand years ago. Human beings require moral and social culture, education, and discipline. Our present modified Christian discipline was derived from our barbarian forefathers. It is pre-Canaanitic, Canaanitic-Jewish, with its numerous reforms ; pre-Christian, Christian, Roman Catholic, Protestant, with its numerous offshoots and different disciplinary reforms now considered obsolete, ineffective, and useless, and the majority of intelligent human beings have not only lost all interest in it, but have rejected it.

7. "*The Followers of Reason*" present the following proposition to the fifty millions of non-church-going citizens for consideration. These are under four different headings : I. To abolish as far as practicable all useless, harmful religious forms, practices, or ceremonies in all our public institutions. II. To effect such changes in our laws as shall put them in harmony with the opinions and ideas of the majority

of the people. III. To amend the laws in such a way that they shall not conflict with the intelligence or interest of the majority, but treat all classes justly and equitably. IV. To introduce and inaugurate on a modern enlightened plane a natural, intelligent, and reasonable system of discipline for the rising generation, with instruction, education, recreation, amusement, and entertainment, mental and physical, for the general improvement and elevation of humanity.

I. (1) *Abolish* the use of the Bible as a sacred book in all public offices, whether national state, or city.

(2) The Bible shall not be used in any form whatever in public buildings, courts of law, or public schools. No part thereof shall be read for any purpose or on any pretext in public buildings or public schools.

(3) Neither the Old nor the New Testament shall be used to swear by in any public office or court of justice, national, state, or city.

(4) Abolish the oath in the name of God, Christ, or any personage considered sacred, and swearing in any form whatsoever, whether verbal or documentary. Abolish the oath of office, whether that of president, governor, judge, juror, or witness, etc.

(5) Abolish all religious fast, feast, and festival days.

(6) Abolish the employment of chaplains in the house of representatives, the senate, state legislature, army, navy, militia, prisons, jails, asylums, and all other public institutions.

II. *We demand* (1) That all properties, such as places of worship, ecclesiastical institutions, private parochial schools, religious universities, monasteries, nunneries, and all other religious estates shall be assessed and be made to pay taxes in the same manner, and at the same rate of valuation, as all secular properties are taxed, whether corporate or private.

(2) That no part of the public revenues or public moneys shall be set apart for and paid over to any ecclesiastical body or religious organization for its maintenance, sustenance, or support.

(3) That no public lands, national, state, or city, or public moneys, shall be presented as a gift or conceded to aid any religious society, organization, or corporation.

(4) That churches, places of worship, and ecclesiastical institutions, shall have no greater privileges, preferences, or prerogatives than any other places of business, entertainment, or amusement. They are private institutions and should be supported by private means.

(5) That our political system of government shall be purely secular in all its branches. That professed Christians shall have no advantage or privilege, before the law, over secular private citizens.

(6) We demand the same rights, freedom, equity, justice, and respect, in all political and civil offices, as witnesses, jurors, or political officers, that Christians are accustomed to enjoy. That judges in courts of justice shall not disqualify or insult a non-Christian unbeliever.

III. *Amendments.*—(1) The Constitutions of the United States and of the several states shall be so amended and regulated, and their practical administration so reformed, that neither Christians nor the adherents of any other special religion shall have more advantages or privileges than other citizens, whether believers or not.

(2) That the laws, national and state, shall be so amended as to abolish all days of religious observances, secular holidays excepted.

(3) That the law shall be so amended that neither president nor governor shall have power to appoint days for religious observances. (Religion is an individual, private concern, not a public institution.)

(4) The law shall be so amended that the "affirma-

tion" shall legally take the place of the oath, carrying with it the pains and penalties of perjury.

(5) That all laws recognizing and enforcing Christian morality shall be repealed. The human conscience is a mental state, depending on the size and weight of brain, and morality is the result of a rational or reasonable education.

(6) All laws having for their object the establishment of Sunday as a Sabbath, a day for religious worship, shall be repealed. It is good as a day of rest, recreation, amusement, or instruction, for each to enjoy as best suits his taste or inclination, within the limits of natural and human laws.

(7) That the laws shall apply alike to all persons found guilty of fraud, forgery, deception, misrepresentation, or false pretenses, whether priest or layman, in the church or elsewhere, whether the offense be known as relic fraud, miracle deception, shrine misrepresentation, or bunco steering. And these practices shall be subject to legal investigation with other crimes of the same nature.

IV. *Human Discipline*.—(1) Discipline, the adopting and conforming to rules for guidance in behavior or conduct, makes men human.

(2) Man originally was not a "human being," but became such by evolution from a primitive animal state, through experience and necessity.

(3) The morality and virtue of primitive man was not greatly superior to that of the highest vertebrate mammal.

(4) Wants increased and discipline improved as man progressed from the lower (barbarous) to the higher (civilized) state; and the regulation of conduct varied with the state of civilization—that is, the degree of culture, training, and education acquired.

(5) Primitive man had primitive wants and primitive discipline; savage men have savage, and civil-

ized men have civilized methods of discipline, each according to his state.

(6) Heathen or pagan religious discipline, whatever it may have been, was only one of the civilizing processes through which men passed, naturally carrying with them many of the moral and social ingredients of their progenitors. Christianity, which is a modified heathenism in a new guise, introduced features exhibiting many peculiarities of its predecessors, just as Protestantism does of Catholicism. Christian discipline has been found to be unintelligible, impracticable, and unreasonable.

(7) Past experience teaches us (a) that children born of human parents inherit endowments, but must be trained, cultured, educated, and made human. (b) Humanity implies discipline, which is necessary. Law and rules we must have for the guidance and regulation of the conduct of men and women. (c) That the instinctive animal desires and passions of the appetites shall be reasonably and intelligently subdued, controlled, and regulated, consistently with the recognized civil, moral, and social laws.

(8) The law of formation and reformation pervades all nature, and every phase, every phenomenon of existence is subject and susceptible thereto; the evolution of a molecule, protoplasm, or cell, growth of plant, or birth of animal, is governed by the laws of formation and reformation. So are the phenomena of nervous function. Our ideas, opinions, rules, customs, laws, the evolution of the human mind, are subject to formation and reformation, and it is always the "what has been" that forms the basis of the "what is to be."

(9) Every human invention has its uses, and serves its purpose for the time being, its services ceasing when superseded by a new and improved invention. Religious ideas have had their uses; they have done their service as a civilizer. From its earliest primi-

tive formation the conception has undergone frequent and radical reformatations, which at stated intervals, as intelligence and understanding increased, successively superseded one another, but never without a struggle.

(10) When ideas, opinions, or customs become deeply rooted, especially among the unthinking classes, it is difficult and sometimes even dangerous to disturb them. Yet the progress made among the masses is truly marvelous, when, considering the wealth displayed and energy put forth by the churches, we reflect that five persons out of every seven in the United States are non-Christians and do not receive Christian discipline.

(11) The world's progress (human progress) depends on men who have the courage to announce their convictions. Were it not that in all ages some men have had the boldness to advance and publish their ideas and opinions, their principles and purposes, to instruct and enlighten the people, we would have returned to primitive barbarism.

(12) As followers of reason, it behooves us to act with discretion and without prejudice, to exercise understanding, and intelligently to adopt such forms and principles of the old discipline as have proved beneficial and serviceable, and reject those which are injurious or useless. Discipline, training, and instruction must begin in childhood, and certain branches of social and moral training must be taught apart from public schooling. We have become accustomed to regard Sunday as a day of rest; Sunday-schools therefore ought to be established for teaching the young, secular, natural lessons of life and morality of a higher order, including arts and sciences of a popular and familiar character, to improve the mind and develop the intellect. There should also be halls for lectures and instruction for adults.

(13) Children, young men, and young women re-

quire recreation, pastime, entertainment, and amusement, but in the humbler and poorer walks of life they are deprived of these on week days, except such as are to be found in low, degrading, demoralizing, and vicious resorts, such as concert halls and saloons, which cater to the lower instincts, desires, and passions of their appetites.

(14) Expensively decorated, luxuriously fitted up places of worship, made attractive for the wealthy, are used as fashionable club houses to amuse them once in awhile. These are open from three to four hours one day in the week (on Sunday), about eight months, one hundred to one hundred and ten hours in the year. Like our theaters and fashionable hotels, these Christian palaces are built in the most fashionable sections of the city, and are of no earthly use to the humbler and poorer industrial classes. What the working classes need and ought to have are not free gifts or charitable institutions, but public buildings, so arranged and constructed as to provide entertainment, instruction, amusement, and recreation. Physical and mental culture should be provided in playrooms for children, libraries, music halls, gymnasiums, and reading-rooms, for the young and for adult, for man and woman, where healthier, more refined, and nobler principles may be inculcated to attract them from low dens of vice, cheap, degrading concert halls, saloons, and churches. These buildings should be located in the most densely populated parts of the city, and maintained at public expense; or they may even be rendered self-supporting by making trifling charges for a certain class of entertainments.

(15) Individual freedom of thought, untrammelled and unshackled by priestly dominion, antique custom, semi-barbarous worship, ancient Semitic conceptions, Christian delusions, hallucination, and superstition, is possible only when these are eradicated, wiped and blotted out of the minds of

men and women, in order to give place to a higher moral state and a greater sense of honor, honesty, and virtue. But so long as we permit the Roman Catholic monastic orders to plant their religious traps all over the country, like so many nets to catch the ignorant and weak-minded, sapping their intelligence and holding them in ecclesiastical meshes, corruption, bribery, fraud, immorality, vice, social evil, and all other abominations will grow and flourish. The lofty pretensions of Christianity are no longer to be trusted. They may deceive and delude the poor, the miserable, the ignorant, and the inexperienced, but they have ceased to influence the intelligent reasoning classes. A reformation must come sooner or later—an intelligent, reasonable, peaceful change. How much longer shall we tolerate Christian morality as it appears in the public press from day to day—corruption in office, bribery in all legislative bodies, congressional, legislative, and municipal; fraud in elections, the selfishness of monopolies, the greed of corporations, and swindling transactions of trusts; vice, crime, social evil, and alcoholism? The time has arrived when an organization of those advanced in the path of mental intellectuality and reason, who have acquired the power of freedom of thought, who think for themselves, who can no longer be influenced by religious belief, should be effected—a united effort having for its object (a) to oppose those religious institutions which for their own selfish gains persist in debasing humanity by teaching the regulation of the appetites and conduct of men by dreams of the ancients and the visions of the demented, and (b) to inaugurate a natural, rational, reasonable system of instruction, and raise men and women to a higher, freethinking, independent, reasoning stage of humanity. When man shall have acquired such a degree of intelligence, knowledge, and understanding as to fully comprehend the consequences of trespass-

ing against himself, inflicting suffering and injury by violation of the laws of nature, and at the same time appreciating the rights of others, he will not trespass against them nor violate the civil, social, or moral laws, rising chiefly out of over-indulgence, or excesses of the appetites, whence all evils and misfortunes spring. Then man will have become a superior human being, enlightened sufficiently to know that both God and sin have their origin in the appetites.

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

